

BULLETIN OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS
LIBRARY
MANCHESTER

VOL. 35

MARCH, 1953

No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

THE important place that the City of Manchester occupies in the political, industrial and academic world is generally recognized and its history, which dates at least from Roman times, has been a long and interesting one. A century ago this month it was raised to the rank of a City, the charter being sealed on 29 March 1853. The Town Clerk, Mr. Philip Dingle, has kindly supplied the following survey of the circumstances which attended the granting of this charter and indicated some of its consequences.

MAN-
CHESTER'S
CENTENARY
AS A CITY.

“Manchester's progress to the dignity of a City was swift, and followed comparatively soon after Incorporation.

“The first three decades of the nineteenth century saw Manchester rapidly expanding under the influence of the Industrial Revolution and quickly outstripping the feudal manorial organization by which it was governed. At that time, of course, local government, as known today, was in its infancy, but the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, afforded a new opportunity for an advance in this direction. In 1838 a Charter of Incorporation was granted to Manchester. From this time onwards Manchester's increasing development as a great civic entity was assured.

“It is interesting to see how the municipality acquired its change of style. Section 61 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, lists only eleven ‘Counties of Cities’ and the census of 1831 listed only twenty-two cities as existing. All these were ancient, and nearly all owed their style to the fact that they were the seat of a Bishop's See. True, it is obvious that such towns

as Worcester and Lichfield, to give examples, had great importance as centres of agriculture and communication through the centuries, and it is likely that this is the reason why cathedrals were built there. By the mid-nineteenth century the ancient cities had been overtaken in importance by the new and lusty offspring of the Industrial Revolution. This gave rise to strange anomalies. For instance, Chester was an ancient City in 1831, while Lancashire could not boast a single municipality so dignified.

“There is some difference of opinion as to whether only a cathedral town can be created a City. The better opinion is that this is not so, and of recent years the title has been conferred upon towns of industrial, historical or academic importance, as in the case of Salford in 1926, Lancaster in 1937 and Cambridge in 1951. But when the thoughts of Mancunians were turning towards greater civic dignity the opposite view seems to have prevailed.

“Fortunately for the status of Manchester the Royal Commission on the State of the Established Church had recommended the formation of two new dioceses of Manchester and Ripon in their first report in 1835. Although it is not generally known, an Order in Council established the See of Manchester in 1836 (at the same time as that of Ripon), but owing to difficulties no further steps were taken in connection with Manchester for another ten years, and the diocese of Manchester was not finally established until 1 September 1847.

“This advance in the general status of Manchester opened the way to achieving the higher dignity.

“It seems that Mancunians regarded their home as a City for some time before the actual Charter was granted. After the creation of the diocese the word City began to appear in municipal documents, and, in fact, it seems to have been generally assumed that the creation of the Bishopric automatically conferred the new dignity. In 1851 Duffields *Strangers' Guide to Manchester* referred to the City Surveyor's Office in the Town Hall. But about the same time Mr. Justice Maule refused to receive an affidavit, or even to permit it to be read, because the jurat stated that the deponent had been sworn in the

City of Manchester. The learned judge said that he knew of no such City. He was of course quite right, but it shows that for some time before the Charter was granted legal draftsmen, that most meticulous race, were commonly referring to Manchester as a City.

" In 1851 a petition for a Charter was actively under discussion at a high level and Lord John Russell, the Prime Minister, expressed himself in favour of granting it. The succeeding government—the Earl of Derby's—feared that an unwelcome precedent might be set and nothing was done in 1852. However, in December of that year another change of government occurred and Lord Palmerston, the new Home Secretary, found the Manchester Petition awaiting attention. He wrote to the Mayor saying that he saw no objection to the borough being elevated to the rank of a City and the affair went forward. The Great Seal was affixed to the Charter on 29 March 1853 and the document was delivered to the Mayor on 1 April of the same year.

" The Charter did very little for Manchester. The borough was to be styled a City and the Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses henceforth became the Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens. The grant of status carried with it ' all such rank, liberties, privileges and immunities as are incident to a City ', but these are very difficult to define. Manchester appears to have accepted its new title calmly. There was no celebration and the official notices were inconspicuously displayed in the press. Probably the Charter merely confirmed what was already common usage.

" The Charter may have had an unrealized effect. In 1704 the first Charter of the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty for the augmentation of poor livings included as Governors ' all and every the mayors of our respective cities within our kingdom of England now and for the time being '. No one has ever been able to say whether this included Mayors of cities created after 1704 and the provision was abolished in 1948, when Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commission were united to form the Church Commissioners under a new constitution. The old link was retained by the inclusion of the Lord Mayors of London and York as members of the new body. However,

from 1853 until 1948 the Mayors and Lord Mayors of Manchester may have been Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty (together with all Privy Councillors, Queen's (or King's) Counsel and holders of various offices to a total of about 700) even if they did not know it.

"No change resulted in the local government of the City until Manchester became a County Borough under the Local Government Act, 1888. A further dignity was conferred in 1893 when the title of Lord Mayor was conferred upon the Mayor.

"Thus it will be seen that Manchester's Charter made no difference to the functioning or organization of the City, but it did mark a forward step in Manchester's development and advance, and undoubtedly gave expression to the powerful civic pride and spirit which is still so apparent, and evidenced by references to citizens of 'no mean city'."

The most notable of the English provincial endowed libraries are those of Manchester and the earliest of these may also claim to have been the first free library in England. Founded in 1653 and still housed in its old collegiate buildings, Chetham's Library this year celebrates its tercentenary. We offer our congratulations on this fine record, and our good wishes for its future. Its Librarian, Miss Hilda Lofthouse, has at our invitation, kindly contributed the following account of its inception and collections.

THE TER-
CENTENARY
OF
CHETHAM'S
LIBRARY.

"Humphrey Chetham, a Manchester merchant and manufacturer, a man well known for his charitable works and public services, died at the age of seventy-three in September 1653 and bequeathed nearly all his considerable fortune for the foundation of the Hospital and Library which bear his name, and for the provision of church libraries at Manchester, Bolton, Walmersley, Gorton and Turton. Of these church libraries the two last still survive.

"The College buildings in Hunt's Bank have been the home of the Hospital and Library for three hundred years. They stand on the site of the old manor house of Manchester and were built to accommodate a Warden and Fellows when the

parish church (now the Cathedral) was collegiate in 1421. At the Dissolution the College was granted by Edward VI to the Earl of Derby, in the possession of whose family it remained until the Civil War, when it was sequestered. Chetham himself negotiated with the Committee of Sequestration for the purchase of the site, but the business was completed after his death by his executors.

"In his will Chetham appointed twenty-four of his friends to act as feoffees or governors of his Hospital and Library and constituted them a self-perpetuating body. A charter of incorporation was granted by Charles II in 1665. The first meeting of the Feoffees took place on 6 December 1653, and the provisions of the Founder's will were soon implemented. Boys whom Chetham had maintained during his lifetime, and others elected after his death, came into residence in 1656. The Library received its first consignment of books in 1655.

"To the Library Chetham bequeathed £100 for adaptation and repair (the building had been damaged during the Civil War), £1,000 to buy books, and, after provision for the School, the residue of his estate to secure an income for maintenance. He did not leave his own collection of books, valued at £20, to the Library, and only one of them, *Considerations of present use concerning the danger resulting from the change of our Church-government* (London, 1744), has since been acquired.

"Three of the Feoffees were nominated by Chetham to buy books, and within a few years they had bought a thousand pounds' worth. In the earliest years there was an emphasis on theology, but history, geography, law, science and literature were all well represented. By 1712 there were some 4,500 volumes, mainly folios, in the Library, and the collection was of sufficient interest to be commented on favourably by several of the scholars of the time. For the first hundred years the books were all chained, in accordance with the Founder's wishes, but the chains were removed about 1750 and the present reading room came into use.

"The Library, which was, and still is, freely open to the public, continued to grow in size and scope, particularly during the terms of office of Robert Thyer (1732-63) and Thomas Jones

(1845-75), and now contains about 65,000 printed books and manuscripts. But since the middle of the nineteenth century the scope has been restricted, partly because of lack of money and lack of space, and partly because of the founding of three other large libraries in the town. The Library now acquires very few books on subjects other than the local history of the north-west of England and such bibliographical and general works as are essential to the study of local history. Its resources for the study of the history of Lancashire and Cheshire have been strengthened in the last few years by the files of reports on manuscripts in private possession in these counties made by the National Register of Archives. The Register is attempting to supplement the work of the Historical Manuscripts Commission by asking local volunteers to survey material with which the Commission has not dealt.

“The older stock of the Library, which is recorded in the *Bibliotheca Chethamensis* (1791-1883, 6 volumes), is of great interest and value, and readers will find books which are not available elsewhere in the area. There are between eighty and ninety incunables; the collection of sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century books is good and covers a wide range of subjects. The manuscript collection is not large, but it contains some interesting material, both literary and historical. The most valuable item is probably the *Flores Historiarum* of Matthew Paris, written at Westminster and St. Albans in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and presented to the Library in 1657 by Nicholas Higginbotome of Stockport. There are several hundred local deeds, and collections of original material and of transcripts made by local antiquaries, from Richard Kuerden and Christopher Towneley in the seventeenth century to Canon F. R. Raines, a nineteenth century historian and one of Chetham's Feoffees.

“By the courtesy of the City Librarian, there will be an exhibition illustrating the history of Chetham's Hospital and Library in the Exhibition Hall of the Central Library from 11 May to 23 May. During the rest of the summer there will be a small exhibition at Chetham's Library.”

The late Sir Frederic Kenyon has described the British Museum as being "next to the British Navy, the national institution which is held in most universal respect abroad". This year it celebrates the bicentenary of its foundation. The circumstances attending its origin, the wealth of its printed and manuscript collections, and its history have been sufficiently dealt with elsewhere and need no repetition here, but we welcome this opportunity of joining in the congratulations and good wishes which all libraries and all scholars will desire to offer to it on this occasion. To mark the bicentenary year the Museum has arranged various exhibitions of its collections. Of the two special series, the central one will include manuscripts, printed books, medals, and prints and drawings relating to the coronations of English Kings and Queens from the tenth century Gospels of Athelstan to the coronation service of King George VI. In July the Museum's origin and growth will be illustrated by an exhibition in the King's Library. In addition to its contributions to the other displays, the Department of Manuscripts is to stage special exhibitions in the Bible Rooms to commemorate the four libraries which formed the foundation of its collections, the Cottonian, the Harleian, the Sloane and the Royal Manuscripts.

THE BI-
CENTENARY
OF THE
BRITISH
MUSEUM.

To add to the important collection of Samaritan manuscripts which it already possesses, the Library has acquired recently an early nineteenth century transcript of two Samaritan liturgical services—one for the Eve of the Feast of the Eighth (day), and the other for the day of the Feast itself. Manuscripts of the service for this feast (the *Mō'ēd ha-Shemīnī*) are sufficiently rare. A. E. Cowley, in preparing his text of the Samaritan liturgy, made use of a manuscript in the British Museum (Add. MS. 19,019) and cited two others as well as one in Berlin. The service as given in the new Rylands MS. is more elaborate than that given in Cowley. In Cowley's text the service of the Eve of the Feast is made part of the service of the day of the Feast itself. In the Rylands MS. it forms a separate service. It has at its end a short colophon and is separated from the service of the day of the Feast by a

A NEW
RYLANDS
SAMARITAN
MANUSCRIPT.

blank page. This colophon is written in Samaritan majuscule and is a curious mixture of Hebrew and Arabic. The scribe is the same for both transcripts.

The colophon at the end of the codex is in Arabic and gives more details than the first. The scribe, by name Taqā, was a member of the high-priestly family. He relates that he finished the copying on the 28th of the sixth month of the year 1249 [A.D. 1833]. He goes on to say that in the course of the transcription he married a daughter of Jamīl, the Danaḥite, he being thirty-three and she seventeen years of age.

The text for the most part is written in Samaritan minuscule in black ink. Rubrics and directions for priest and congregation are mostly in Arabic and written in red ink.

Among a small group of Lancashire documents (sixteenth and seventeenth century) recently presented to the Library by Mr. B. Cozens-Hardy is one which throws light on the popular seventeenth century pastime of bowls. Bowls has been described as, next to archery, the oldest British outdoor pastime still in vogue, and certainly it has a history of some seven or eight centuries in this country. Although the present document is, in these circumstances, hardly remarkable for its age, it is of interest for the detail it provides. It is an agreement made between Dame Ann Assheton and William Johnson, fustian weaver, both of Middleton, respecting "the bowlinge greene on the Holts Banke in Midleton", whereby William undertakes that he will "duringe the wille and pleasure of . . . the said Dame Ann . . . clense and dresse the bowlinge greene . . . aforesaid with mowinge, rowlings, sweepinge and dressinge, soe often as need shall require . . . and shall not suffer anie rude or disordered persons to bowle upon the said greene". In return he is to receive a yearly sum of ten shillings, of which four are to be the annual rent due to Ann for the house and croft occupied by Prudence Johnson, his mother, and six the remainder of his wage and hire at Michaelmas. In addition, it is agreed that William "shall and wil be careful of and accountable for sixe pair of great bowles and the blocke [i.e. the jack],

BOWLS IN
LANCASHIRE,
1667.

and orders for the greene and the case for them, the rowler and the frame, and to be carefull of all other things that belonge to the said bowlinge green. And shall likewise give due attendance to gentlemen when they shall have occasion to bowle there, and shall not permitt or suffer anie person or persons to plea [play] att anie other recreation but bowlinge upon the said green." The full date of this document is 7 February 1667.

In a recent number of the BULLETIN attention was drawn to a collection of letters from the agriculturist Arthur Young which came to light among the Bagshawe Muniments deposited in this Library. Originally forming part of the archives of the Caldwells of Castle Caldwell, co. Fermanagh, a family related to the Bagshawes by an eighteenth-century marriage, they had found their way into these Muniments as the result of the genealogical interests of the late Mr. W. H. G. Bagshawe. Additional papers of Mr. Bagshawe have since been forwarded to the Library by the present head of the family, Major F. E. G. Bagshawe of Ford Hall, co. Derby, and among them has been found further material concerning Young, together with information which throws light on the history of his correspondence and papers.

SOME MANU-
SCRIPTS CON-
CERNING
ARTHUR
YOUNG
(1741-1820).

Arthur Young, a former Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, and perhaps the greatest English writer on agriculture, died in 1820, and his manuscripts and books descended through his son, the Rev. Arthur Young, to his grandson, also named Arthur. With the death of the grandson in 1896 the family became extinct, and their seat, Bradfield Hall in Suffolk, was sold. In the same year the agriculturist's books were also sold, and in 1896 and 1897 certain of his manuscripts went to the British Museum, notably eight bound volumes of letters. It seems, however, from information in the Bagshawe Muniments, that autobiographical records and other letters consulted by Miss Betham-Edwards for her *The Autobiography of Arthur Young* (1898) accompanied Sarah Young, widow of the grandson, when she moved from Bradfield to Fulbeck. On her death in

1901 they passed into the possession of her niece, Mrs. Rose Willson of Fulbeck Rectory, Grantham. W. H. G. Bagshawe, who was interested in tracing a possible connection between his wife's family, the Bowmers, and Jane Berry, who married the Rev. Arthur Young, visited Bradfield Hall in 1859, and in the same year began a correspondence with the Youngs which, after Sarah's death, he continued with Mrs. Willson. It was as a result of this contact that in 1905 Mrs. Willson presented him with certain of the Young papers. The gift consisted of fourteen letters of the Rev. Arthur Young and a manuscript of eleven leaves concerning his father. It is not improbable that the latter is one of the original materials drawn on by Miss Betham-Edwards for the *Autobiography*. As that work is known to be an abridgment of records and letters loaned to her by Sarah Young, it is perhaps also worth noting that the Bagshawe manuscript, which contains marked passages corresponding to pages 446 to 452, has some eight leaves of additional material relating to Young which is not there printed. The fourteen letters mentioned above were written by the Rev. Arthur Young during his travels abroad, mainly from Russia, and they are filled with information about social and economic conditions in that country during the early nineteenth century, totalling in all some sixty pages. The first five letters, which date from between 1805 and 1818, are addressed to his father, the agriculturist, and are almost in the nature of reports. Two others are to his mother, and the remaining seven, written to his wife between 1810 and 1823, contain a full and interesting account of his travels in South Russia.

The Emperor Napoleon, exiled to Elba by the Congress of Vienna, disembarked at Porto-Ferrajo on 4 May 1814 to begin his banishment of less than a year. In his island kingdom he attracted the attention and held the interest of the world of his day. Porto-Ferrajo swarmed with important visitors anxious to see and, if possible, to gain the honour of an interview with him. Many Englishmen sought this privilege and were probably more successful than aspirants of other nationalities, for Napoleon

AN INTER-
VIEW WITH
NAPOLEON.

entertained a healthy respect for the English army and English institutions and would not have been averse to spending his exile in England. Amongst the English visitors to Porto-Ferrajo was Edward Davies Davenport of Capesthorpe Hall, Cheshire, who spent some time seeking an interview in vain. Finally he succeeded, and in a letter to his sister Harriet he writes enthusiastically of his conversation with Napoleon. The interview is particularly interesting because it took place on 7 December. About this time, according to Peyrassé, Napoleon's Treasurer, there had come to the island a mysterious stranger who was closeted with His Majesty for a whole evening and slipped away on the following morning. It was evidently to a Napoleon buoyant in spirits and with plans for returning to France in mind that Davenport was introduced. Napoleon was particularly anxious to know the attitude of the French people towards him. The letter, which is among the Bromley-Davenport Muniments deposited in this Library, is dated from Porto-Ferrajo on 8 December 1814, and runs:—"When I have to tell you that I have had a tête-à-tête with the greatest man that ever lived, I fear certain homely similes such as cats looking at kings, pearls being thrown before swine, etc. etc. will occur to your fruitful imagination. The event, however, took place this day under very inauspicious circumstances. First, he had (*entre nous soit dit*) had an interview with one of our trio who, among other relevant questions, asked him whether 'he had taken 60,000 pair of spectacles with him into Russia?'!! This or some accidental circumstance had probably rendered our Emperor somewhat indifferent as to receiving the other two, so that last night, finding the land exceedingly dull, no audience talked of, and the fleas strong in the land, I writ a civil note to General Drouaut [Drouot] requesting he would inform me whether he thought that by prolonging my stay here I should increase my chance of an audience, to which he returned last night the following most satisfactory answer: 'L'empereur m'a dit aujourd'hui qu'il recevrait Mons^r. Davenport demain. Aussitôt qu'il indiquera l'heure, je ne manquerai point de vous en prévenir'. The obvious consequence of this was that I could not get to sleep last night, and this morning dressed and roused

my servant at four, rode over a great part of the island and came back here to wait for the desired event, which was announced at last at the unlucky hour of 5½ o'clock, which necessarily limited the extent of the audience *to an hour* (and that hour the usual one of my dinner), as he always dines before seven. Accordingly I went up to his palace where I found Drouaut (governor of the island), who had before been extremely attentive and civil and who was very good company until Napoleon announced that he was ready to receive me. Drouaut meanwhile told me that Napoleon *was certainly writing his memoirs* but that he thought his intention was to keep them by him until after his death for two reasons. First, because the publication of the secrets of most of the activities of Europe might create present disturbances, and secondly because full faith might be refused to evidence which during his own life might be supposed to have a selfish tendency. I was at length shown into Napoleon, who is certainly a very good looking man and not to be charged with any of the ridiculous personal defects which Douglas and others in their fun attributed to him. He appears in the greatest health and has, I think, a very handsome and the most agreeable and intelligent countenance I ever saw. His manner exceeds even what one might expect of such an exterior, and I think I shall be borne out in saying that a more acute and more kind or condescending and unaffected manner never graced a *gentleman*, much more a statesman and hero. His manner is so prepossessing that it instantly disarms one of all the idle terrors of his presence and of that eye which nothing escapes and which it is almost impossible to meet for any length of time. He had been all the morning tiring himself in the country and, having told almost everything that could possibly interest an enquirer in his recent audiences with Douglas, Colonel Campbell, Messrs Fazakerley and Vernon, I could expect little but repetition, which in fact was the case, which, coupled with his fatigue and probable eagerness to get to his dinner, made what I shall have to detail of *new matter* somewhat scanty compared with what I had fondly expected and with what, if I had time, I meant to have fished out. Putting aside his usual enquiries as to the state and disposition of France towards himself and the Bourbons,

his questions about myself, my country, my service, etc. etc., I got him upon the subject of the peace, which he said he thought and hoped would be durable because the Bourbons had no business nor inclination to meddle with war nor, said he, ought they. In answer to my question whether we should succeed or not with America, he replied 'Oh, il faut faire la paix avec elle et la paix se fera bientôt'. I made him repeat his assurance of the probability of peace lasting on the Continent, hinting the manner in which Piémont [*sic*] and Belgium were left open to France whenever he chose to attack them, but without making him in the least change his mind. He said we ought to have kept our word pledged through Lord William Bentinck with regard to the independence of Genoa, who would never suffer herself to be united with Piedmont. 'Il faut qu'elle appartienne ou à l'Angleterre ou à la France, mais il faut en cas de son indépendance qu'elle ait *une bandière*.' The meaning of which is, that we are to lend our flag to her or, what comes to the same cause, hers to be respected. He asked me about the king of Sardinia, 'Est-il vrai qu'il chasse tout le monde?' 'Non, monsieur, mais on dit qu'il ne paye personne' (a great laugh), 'mais bien sûr, il chasse tout le monde qui veut s'établir là. Sire, la seule chasse dont ont [on] m'a parlé été [était] de quelque [quelques] lièvres qu'ont [on] avaient [avait] mis dans un jardin pour l'amusement de S.M.' He then asked me where I had seen any service and I told him the last time was with the Right of the Allied armies, at which he turned away his head and said not a word, to my great annoyance, as I wished to have got him to the battle of Laon. He then asked where else, and I said in Spain with Castaños. He asked what I thought of their troops. 'Très mal, Sire.' 'C'est vrai, j'étais fort mécontent d'eux, cependant ils ont beaucoup de cara[c]tère; mais ils ne veulent jamais rester fermes, même sur une montagne. Comment cela arrive-t-il? Mauvais cadre, mauvais officiers.' He seemed ignorant of the affairs of Castaños and Reding, but when I told him the latter had only 15,000 men, he said Dupont was more inexcusable [*sic*] than he had thought him before in not overcoming them. He said 'Cette bataille là décida sur le sort de l'Europe,' at which I pretended surprise, but he repeated it. I said Dupont

had pleaded want of food and sickness in his army. 'Non cela, [c'] était impossible.' I asked then whether he thought Dupont could have got into Cadiz had he hurried on apace. 'Non, probablement non. Comment avez-vous trouvé la France? Que disait-ton [on] des Bourbons?' Does your majesty wish that I should speak plainly? 'Oui, oui, dites' (with very great eagerness). Then, quoth I, I think all quite [sic] people are for the Bourbons et tous [tous] les Militaires pour Votre Majesté. I thought he did not seem quite satisfied with this bargain. What else did you remark? That there never existed one quarter of the antipathy on our side against France that now subsists among the French against us. 'Ha! You ought never to have put your prisoners on board ship. I always remonstrated, indeed I threatened to put your prisoners on board my ships, which you know would have been still worse—mais enfin . . .' as much as to say I only meant to threaten but not to practise the cruelty. Sir, quoth I, these ships were of the largest dimensions, they were cleaner and more healthy than land prisons.—'Oh', said he, 'but merely to put a landsman on board a ship is the most cruel of all punishments to him', an observation of which painful experience made me feel the justice. He said that he looked upon the Mont Cenis as a sufficient barrier against France. 'Vous l'aurez passé sans doute? Avez-vous déjeuné avec mes moines? Vous savez que j'ai fait des moines, moi!', with much fun in his countenance. He asked how I had damaged my eyes, whether in Egypt, in bivouacing, or how. Whether I had found Paris cheaper than London and in what proportion. It was now near 7 and he had Standish yet to see before dinner, so he dismissed me after the most curious and interesting $\frac{3}{4}$ of an hour I ever passed or probably ever shall pass while I live."

During the latter part of 1952 book-purchase has, for the most part, been restricted to the acquisition of current books necessary to keep the Library's various collections up-to-date, but it has also been possible to fill a number of gaps with such works as the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum*, in twelve volumes; *The biographical dictionary of Ibn Khallikan*, translated by the

PRINTED
BOOKS:
ACCESSIONS.

Baron McGuckin de Slane, in four volumes ; and Prisse d'Avennes, *Histoire de l'art égyptien*, in three volumes. Attention has again been given to overtaking war arrears in foreign series, and sets completed within the last few months include *Archivio storico veneto*, the *Bulletin* and *Publications* of the *Société de l'histoire de France* and *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*.

The high prices of current works, particularly of those published in certain continental countries, make it difficult to spare funds for the purchase of rare or fine books. Among the comparatively few items in this class purchased may be mentioned a large paper copy of the fine edition of Cardinal de Richelieu's *L'instruction du chrestien*, printed by the Imprimerie Royale in 1642, and a copy of the Duke of Wellington's contribution to the Roxburghe Club, *The correspondence of the first Duke of Wellington*. This latter volume, with *A thirteenth century York Psalter* and *Rumpel Stiltskin*, which were a generous gift from Sir Thomas D. Barlow, makes our set of the Club's publications, formerly in the Spencer collection, complete. To many other donors, both individual and institutional, the Library is indebted for substantial gifts.

From Mr. A. Preston Pearce, of Plymouth, a most welcome gift was received, which materially strengthens our collection of ephemerides. This comprises 207 almanacks and companions covering eighty-seven years between 1681 and 1866. Particularly interesting are the late seventeenth century items, amongst them a group of ten almanacks from one year, 1684. Between 1681 and 1700 there are issues of eight almanacks not previously represented in the Library ; all are rare, and of one, "Goldsmith 1681", no other copy appears to be known. Three years, 1793, 1796 and 1803 are covered by volumes containing the same series of eight almanacks. In several cases, when the Library possessed only one or very few issues of an almanack, Mr. Pearce's gift has converted the odd issues into substantial series. To the seven numbers of Moore's *Vox stellarum* are now added a further thirty-nine issues ; to the one issue (1703) of Rider's *British Merlin*, twelve between 1767 and 1811 ; and to the one issue (1800) of *The royal kalendar*, twenty-four volumes from 1767 to 1831. In other cases, as,

for instance, White's *Coelestial atlas*, of which a fairly complete set was already in the Library, Mr. Pearce has been able to contribute single issues which fill gaps. The gift has supplemented the Library's holding in a remarkable manner and has added to its working value in a marked degree.

A second gift of importance is that of Mr. George Benson, M.P. for Chesterfield, consisting of a number of early publications of the Independent Labour Party which are now difficult to obtain. Included are five volumes of *The Labour annual* between 1895 and 1905, *The I.L.P. news*, vols. 1-5, 1897-1902, *The I.L.P. year-book*, 1909 (-1913), and *The report of the first (-thirty-first) conference of the I.L.P.*, 1893 (-1923). Mr. Benson informs us that he has never seen so complete a run of the Conference reports, and he thinks it improbable that another such set exists. This generous gift forms a valuable pendent to the collection of rare books and journals illustrating the early development of Socialist thought which the same donor presented to the Library in 1949.

During the past few months further additions have been made to our exchange-list, and as a result publications are being received from a further twenty learned bodies in twelve different countries. These include the universities of Bratislava, Liège, New Mexico, Saint Bonaventure, Salamanca and Tucuman, and societies or libraries in Adelebsen, Bern, Brussels, Cairo, New Delhi, Philadelphia, Rangoon, and Vienna. In most cases the exchanges commence with the current volume, but, amongst others, we have received complete sets of the *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery*, Baltimore, the *Bulletin of the Fouad I University*, Giza, the New Series of *Franciscan studies*, and the publications, within our field of interest, of the University of New Mexico. Among exchanging libraries, both old and new, from whom fine gifts of their publications have been received may be mentioned the Ateneo di Brescia, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek at Munich, the National Archives of the United States, the Zentralbibliothek at Zürich, and the University libraries of Helsinki, Kentucky, Milan (Università Cattolica del S. Cuore), Pennsylvania, Rennes, Stockholm, Utrecht, and Virginia.

Below is a list of the donors to the Library during the latter half of 1952, and to them the Governors offer their grateful thanks :

Individual Donors

John Barlow, Esq. [23].	T. K. Joseph, Esq.
Sir Thomas D. Barlow [2].	J. Baxter Lee, Esq. [5].
George Benson, Esq., M.P. [46].	Mrs. E. Bosdin Leech [10].
Mrs. Bonnett.	The Rev. S. Levy.
Monsieur A. Boutemy.	The Librarian.
R. E. Bracewell, Esq. [6].	Mrs. J. B. Macalpine [2].
Dr. W. Brockbank.	The Rt. Rev. Monsignor Justin McCann [3].
Dr. Curt F. Bühler [8].	Francis Neilson, Esq. [2].
Dr. R. W. Chapman [3].	Professor O. Neugebauer.
Miss E. B. Collier [2].	Dr. Vincent Næser [9].
A. M. Cox, Esq.	C. B. Oldman, Esq., C.B.
V. N. Crasnoff, Esq.	A. Preston Pearce, Esq. [225].
J. D. Croghan, Esq.	Mrs. O. Pemberton.
Professor Otto Eissfeldt.	Boies Penrose, Esq.
W. T. Fleming, Esq. [2].	The Rev. Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D. [3].
Signor G. Giangrande.	Meinheer J. Schwenke.
R. F. Gibb, Esq.	Monsieur O. Schneider.
Miss Lois Adlington Haworth [4].	Dr. I. W. Slotki.
The Rev. H. Hassall, M.C.	The Rev. W. H. Thompson.
Dr. Albert Hollaender.	Dr. Walter Till.
W. Ferguson Irvine, Esq.	C. R. Woodring, Esq.
H. W. Jones, Esq.	

Societies and Institutions

Aberdeen University.
 Aberystwyth : National Library of Wales.
 Albuquerque : University of New Mexico [27].
 American Catholic Philosophical Association.
 American Philosophical Society.
 Baltimore : Walters Art Gallery [16].
 Bebington Public Library [253].

Bern : Stadtbibliothek [2].

Birmingham University.

Bratislava : Knižnica Slovenskej Univerzity [14].

Brescia : Ateneo [17].

British Academy.

British Council.

British Museum [2].

Bruxelles : Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie [5].

Burma Research Society.

California University Library [3].

Canada : United Church : Archives Committee.

Conakry : Centre de l'Institut Français de l'Afrique Noire [7].

Copenhagen : Royal Library [2].

Copenhagen University Library [4].

Czecho-Slovakia : Department of Education [3].

Edinburgh : National Library of Scotland [2].

Edinburgh University.

Eisenstadt : Burgenländische Landesarchiv [22].

Franciscan Studies, Editor of [11].

Friends of the John Rylands Library : Hebraic Section [3].

Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte.

Giza : Fouad I University [14].

Glamorgan County Council : Record Office.

Glasgow University Library [7].

Gloucestershire County Council : Archives Committee.

Göteborg University Library.

Groningen University Library [9].

Hamburg : Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.

Helsinki : Academia Scientiarum Fennica [64].

Helsinki University Library [16].

Illinois University Library.

Ismaili Society.

Kansas University Library.

Kentucky University Library [12].

Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Leeds University.

Liège University Library.
Lincolnshire County Council : Archives Committee.
Linz : Oberösterreichische Musealverein.
Liverpool University.
London : School of Oriental and African Studies.
London : Victoria & Albert Museum.
Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd.
Lund University Library.
Manchester : Royal Infirmary.
Manchester Statistical Society.
Manchester University [2].
Manchester University Press [3].
Massachusetts Historical Society.
Michigan University : General Library.
Milan : Università Cattolica del S. Cuore [16].
Munich : Bayerische Staatsbibliothek [3].
New York University Library.
New Zealand : High Commissioner in London [5].
Northampton, Mass. : Smith College Library [2].
Paris : Byzantine Institute [5].
Philadelphia : Pennsylvania University Library [7].
Piacenza : Collegio Alberoni.
Prague : Československy Orientální Ústav.
Pretoria : State Library.
Quaracchi : Collegio S. Bonaventura.
Reading University.
Rennes University [7].
Revista portuguesa de filosofia, Editor of.
Rome : Istituto Storico Domenicano.
Saint Andrews University Library [3].
Saint Louis : Washington University Library.
Salamanca University Library [9].
Saragossa : Real Seminario Sacerdotal.
Scottish Secretariat, Ltd.
Sheffield University.
Singapore, Colony of : Government.
Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Stockholm : Högskolas Humanistiska Bibliotek [8].

Strasbourg University : Faculté des Lettres [2].

Sweden : Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Swedenborg Society [2].

UNESCO.

United States of America : National Archives [16].

Utrecht University Library [19].

Vienna : Nationalbibliothek [7].

Vienna University Library.

Virginia University Library [21].

Washington : Library of Congress.

Washington : Smithsonian Institution : Library.

Zürich : Zentralbibliothek [35].

In addition to these donations many learned societies and other bodies have continued to present copies of their periodical publications.

The following public lectures (the fifty-first series) were delivered in the lecture-hall of the Library during the session 1952-3, at 3 p.m. in the afternoon :

8 October 1952. "Browning : The Making of the Dramatic Lyric." By H. B. Charlton, Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.

THE FIFTY-
FIRST SERIES
OF
RYLANDS
PUBLIC
LECTURES.

12 November 1952. "St. Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians." By T. W. Manson, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester.

10 December 1952. "Public and Private Themes in Modern Drama." By Ronald Peacock, Professor of German in the University of Manchester.

14 January 1953. "Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln." By Sir Maurice Powicke, formerly Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

11 February 1953. "The Book of Ezechiel in Modern Study." By Harold H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.

11 March 1953. "War and Peace in Virgil's 'Aeneid'." By W. H. Semple, Hulme Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester.

The following is a list of recent Library publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the last issue of the BULLETIN (September 1952):

RECENT
LIBRARY
PUBLICATIONS.

- "The Letters of Pope Innocent III." By C. R. Cheney, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 21. Price two shillings net.
- "The Achievement of Saladin." By H. A. R. Gibb, Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford. 8vo, pp. 17. Price two shillings net.
- "Das Lied Vom Hürnen Seyfrid: The Printers and Orthography of a Sixteenth-Century German Text." By K. C. King, Senior Lecturer in German in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 27. Price two shillings and sixpence net.
- "The Revolutionary Committee of the Paris Sections in 1793: A Manuscript in the John Rylands Library." By R. B. Rose. 8vo, pp. 23, with plate. Price two shillings and sixpence net.
- "The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls." By Harold H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 44. Price three shillings net.
- "Skriptorium und Bibliothek der Cistercienserabtei Himmerod im Rheinland: Zur Geschichte Klösterlichen Bibliothekswesens im Mittelalter." By Dr. P. Ambrosius Schneider, S.O. Cist., Abtei Himmerod. 8vo, pp. 51, with two plates. Price three shillings and sixpence net.
- "The Proof-Sheets of Dr. Johnson's Preface to Shakespeare." By Arthur Sherbo, Instructor in English in the University of Illinois. 8vo, pp. 5. Price one shilling net.
- "Johnsoniana from the Bagshawe Muniments in the John Rylands Library: Sir James Caldwell, Dr. Hawkesworth, Dr. Johnson, and Boswell's Use of the 'Caldwell Minute'." By F. Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library. 8vo, pp. 37. Price three shillings net.
- "Some Illustrated Manuscripts of the Lives of the Saints." By Francis Wormald, Professor of Palaeography in the University of London. 8vo, pp. 19, with plate. Price two shillings and sixpence net.

ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE IN MAIMONIDES¹

BY RABBI ALEXANDER ALTMANN, D.PHIL., M.A.

MAIMONIDES defines existence (wudjūd) as "an accident ('araḍ) affecting (lit. happening to) that which exists (mawdjūd), and therefore something (ma'na) superadded to the essence (māhiyyat) of that which exists". He immediately qualifies this definition by restricting it to "all beings the existence of which is due to a cause". The existence of such beings, and of such beings only, will be something superadded to their essence. But a being whose existence is not due to any cause will contain being in its very essence. The only such Being is God, the necessary Existent. In him, therefore, essence and existence are perfectly identical. "The existence of such a Being is its essence and truth, and its essence is its existence" (*Guide*, i. 57).

It can hardly be doubted that the above statement reflects Avicenna's famous theory concerning essence and existence, and the commentators of the *Guide* have not been slow in pointing out this fact. Moses of Narbonne and Shemtob ben Joseph take the opportunity of assailing Maimonides from the point of view of Averroes' critique of Avicenna's doctrine, whilst others (Shemtob Ibn Falaquera and Asher Crescas) are content to reproduce some of the arguments used by Avicenna and Averroes respectively.² Maimonides himself introduces his statement by referring to the theory he is about to explain as one "well-known" and, to all intents and purposes, commonly accepted. He has obviously not had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with Averroes' attack on Avicenna's doctrine.³

¹ The present article was one of a series presented to Dr. S. van den Bergh, the distinguished scholar, philosopher, and teacher, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

² We learn incidentally that Shemtob ben Joseph composed a treatise on this particular subject which, unfortunately, appears to be lost. Two other treatises of his, one on Matter and its Relation to Form, and one on Final Causes, are extant in manuscripts. Cf. *JE.*, s.v. Ibn Shemtob.

³ This corroborates the prevalent assumption that, at the time of his writing the *Guide*, Maimonides was as yet unacquainted with the work of Averroes.

He must also have had in mind the fact that Avicenna's theory of essence and existence had gained some currency in Jewish philosophical writings. Thus amongst the Jewish Neoplatonists Gabirol and Jehudah Halleivi clearly state that in the case of all beings except God existence is different from essence.¹ But the question arises in what sense Maimonides understood existence to be an "accident" to essence. Did he attribute to Avicenna the view which was made the target of Averroes' subsequent attack, or did he interpret him in a different manner? This question is of added interest in view of the fact that only recently an attempt has been made to re-interpret Avicenna's doctrine and to clear it of the criticisms levelled against it by Averroes.²

We shall best open our enquiry by examining Maimonides' notion of essence. Here Maimonides stands solidly on Aristotelian ground. Aristotle had defined essence as that which a thing is said to be *per se* and which has its formula in the definition (*Met.* VII. iv. 4-5). "Essence belongs to all things the

Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle* (1929), p. 323. The famous Letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon in which Maimonides reviews the contemporary philosophical literature and mentions Averroes twice was written after the completion of the *Guide*. Cf. J. Sonne, *Tarbiz*, ed. J. N. Epstein, Jerusalem, x. (1939), p. 147. The Verona MS. of the Letter published by Sonne does not contain the relevant paragraph but merely alludes to it. Another version of the Letter published by Alexander Marx from Codex Adler 2013 proves again inconclusive by virtue of the fact that the MS. is mutilated just where the reference to Averroes occurs in the Constantinople edition. Cf. *JQR*, N.S., xxv (1934-5), p. 375. A critical edition of the Letter has been announced by D. H. Baneth in *Tarbiz*, xxiii (1952), p. 171. From a Letter written by Maimonides to his favourite disciple, Joseph ben Jehudah Ibn Aḳnin and dated 1190, more definite conclusions can be drawn. There he mentions the fact that he had just received all the writings of Averroes except one and praises Averroes as "hitting the mark". He expresses regret at not having as yet had an opportunity of going over all his books. Cf. D. H. Baneth, *'Iggērot Ha-Rambam*, ed. Meḳize Nirdamīm, Jerusalem (1946), pp. 33, 70. Seeing that the *Guide* had been completed by 1190, it is obvious that he had not been able to draw on Averroes' writings at the time of its composition. Shemtob Ibn Falaquera's assertion to the contrary cannot be substantiated. Cf. *Moreh Ha-Moreh* (1837), p. 8.

¹ Cf. *Fons Vitae*, ed. C. Bäumker, v. 24; *Kuzari*, iv. 25 (Cassel, p. 354).

² As Dr. F. Rahman has shown, Averroes' reading of Avicenna is not borne out by the relevant texts of the *Kitāb al-Shifā'*. Unfortunately, it has misled all subsequent interpretation of Avicenna's doctrine. Dr. Rahman's thesis has been presented in a paper on "Essence and Existence in Avicenna" read before the Scottish Society for Ancient Philosophy, and kindly made available to the present writer.

account of which is a definition" (*Met.* VII. iv. 9). Maimonides says likewise that amongst the Five Praedicabilia "species" constitutes the "essence" of the individuals to which it is common. Seeing that species itself contains genus and specific difference, essence coincides with the definition which is composed of the same elements (*Treatise on Logic*, x. 1). Thus the terms "rational animal" which express the definition of man constitute the essence (ḏāt) and truth (ḥaḳīḳ) of man (*Guide*, i. 51, 52). It may be noted that Maimonides is fond of calling the essence the "truth" of a thing (*Guide*, i. 33, 51). He no doubt means thereby the true being of a thing in the same way in which Aristotle regards the essence as the very being of a thing. He does not seem to have noticed the difficulty of attributing essence to God which arises from his own concept of essence. Seeing that a definition consisting of the *genus* and the *differentia* is inapplicable to God, the term "essence" should be likewise inapplicable to God. Maimonides, like his Jewish predecessors, emphatically states that no definition can be given of God (*Guide*, i. 52).¹ Yet he does not hesitate to speak of God's essence.² We are therefore compelled to assume that Maimonides uses the term "essence" in two *toto coelo* different senses when speaking of God and all other beings respectively. From his statement that the *Tetragrammaton* "includes nothing but His essence" one might infer that "essence" in the case of God is identical with "necessary existence"; for this, he says, is the meaning of that proper name (*Guide*, i. 61). The *Tetragrammaton*, he says in another place, implies nothing except God's existence (i. 53, end). It expresses the notion of God as the necessary Existent, and is identical with the name "I AM THAT I AM" (Exod. iii. 14) which God revealed to Moses (i. 63).³ In God, essence and existence

¹ Cf. Jehudah Hallevi, *Kuzari*, iv. 25 (Cassel, p. 354); Abraham Ibn Daud, *Emunah Ramah*, ed. Weil, pp. 46, 52.

² God is "a simple essence" (i. 53); Will and Wisdom are one with His essence (i. 69; iii. 13); His essence is unknowable (i. 54, 58); and *passim*.

³ The Latin schoolmen, too, interpreted the name "I AM THAT I AM" as denoting the very essence of God. Cf. Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (1950), pp. 51 ff. This interpretation goes back to Philo of Alexandria. Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (1947), i, pp. 19, 210; ii, pp. 120-1.

are one (i. 57). Maimonides prefers this formula rather than the more radical one of the Jewish Neoplatonists and of Ghazālī who had described God as existence without essence.¹

What kind of existence does Maimonides attribute to essence? Here again he is a strict Aristotelian. Form or essence, Aristotle had said, does not exist independently. It is not a self-subsistent substance, for otherwise it could not be contained in an actually existing substance (*Met.* VII. viii. 6). On the other hand, neither form nor essence are generated. The concrete whole is generated, for generation means inducing form or essence into particular matter (*Met.* VII. viii. 3-5). Maimonides likewise holds that, as a universal, essence has no independent existence. "It is an established fact that species have no existence outside our minds, and that species and other universals are concepts appertaining to the intellect, whilst everything that exists outside our minds is an individual or an aggregate of individuals" (*Guide*, iii. 18). At the same time, forms, unlike the combinations of the elements, do not change. They remain in their self-same natures, and appear and disappear instantaneously according to the ability of matter to receive them (ii. 12). Maimonides does not further analyse the peculiar mode of being that attaches to essence or form as something existing only in concrete individuals and yet transcending them. He might have assigned to essence the character of something mid-way between being and non-being which certain schools of Kalām had attributed to the universals. Maimonides does indeed make reference to this particular theory, but only to reject it. Speaking about the attributes of God, he mentions the Kalām doctrine according to which the attributes of God are neither His essence nor anything extraneous to His essence. "This", he adds, "is like the assertion of others that the 'states' (aḥwāl), i.e. universal

¹ Cf. Gabirol, *Fons Vitae*, v. 24; Shemtob Ibn Falaquera, *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, pp. 28 f.; Joseph Ibn Zaddīk, *Microcosm*, ed. Horovitz, p. 48; Asher Crescas' Commentary on the *Guide*, i. 57. As to Ghazālī, see T. de Boer, *Die Widersprüche der Philosophie nach Al-Gazālī und ihr Ausgleich durch Ibn Rosd* (1894), pp. 53 f.; H. A. Wolfson, *Crescas on Divine Attributes*, in *JQR*, N.S. vii (1916-17), pp. 189-191. Avicenna's view has met with a twofold interpretation. Ghazālī understood him to suggest that God is existence without essence; Averroes attributed to him the view that in God essence and existence are one. Cf. Wolfson, *ibid.*

concepts, are neither existing nor non-existent." This view he strongly repudiates. There is, he says, no mean between existence and non-existence (*Guide*, i. 51). Both the theological doctrine referred to and the ḥāl theory belong to the same school of thought. Abū Hāshim introduced the ḥāl theory as a means of reconciling the concept of the unity of God, which implies simplicity of essence, with the affirmation of distinct attributes. Do the latter not constitute accidental qualities in God? The answer put forward is to the effect that there is a *tertium quid* between essence and accidental attributes, i.e. the "states" such as wisdom, power, life which are one with the essence and yet conceptually different.¹ This doctrine was accepted also by members of the Ash'arite school. Al-Djuwainī, the teacher of Ghazālī, defined a "state" (ḥāl) as an attribute of an existing thing, being itself neither existent nor non-existent.² It would appear that Maimonides referred to this formula when rejecting the theory of *aḥwāl*.³ It is obvious that it could not solve for him the problem of the mode of being attached to essence seeing that the ḥāl, according to this theory, stands in between the essence and the accident. It is a notion specifically designed to fit a theological requirement. But it should be borne in mind that the concept of ḥāl has also a wider significance in the thinking of Kalām, and re-echoes, as Dr. van den Bergh has shown, the Stoical concept of "states" (πὺς ἔχον) under which the Stoics, to the displeasure of Plotinus, had subsumed most of the accidental categories.⁴ The facts designated under this term constitute a something "neither corporeal nor non-corporeal", i.e. a "meaning" (ἐννόημα) in an objective sense and akin to the Platonic Forms.⁵ This realm of "meaning" includes not only universals and essences but also illusions and errors. Maimonides, however, does not avail himself of this

¹ Cf. Theodor Haarbrücker, *Scharastāni's Religionspartheien und Philosophen-Schulen* (1850), i, pp. 83 ff.; David Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Attributenlehre in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie* (1877), p. 35, n. 65.

² Cf. *Kitāb al-Irshād*, ed. Luciani, p. 47 (81).

³ Neither Munk (*Guide*, i. 185, n. 2) nor Friedländer (*Guide*, i. 176, n. 1) seem to have understood this reference.

⁴ Cf. H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ii. 131, 124.

⁵ Op. cit. i. 19, 117.

notion. He says of fictitious beings such as the griffin, the centaur and similar figments of the imagination, simply that they are non-existent. On the other hand, a true essence exists only in the concrete individual. Its universality arises from the intellectual process of abstraction. Maimonides is thus a true Aristotelian.¹ It follows that essences do not exist in an ideal realm of their own but "appear" in individual substances in which alone they have their being.²

This brings us to the important question of the relationship between essence and substance. A clarification of this issue will help us to appreciate Maimonides' view-point concerning essence and existence.

What emerges from Aristotle's discussion of substance is the fact that substance has two fundamentally different meanings. In one sense substance is identical with the "what" of a thing, i.e. its essence. In another sense, it is the concrete particular thing. Aristotle does not always clearly distinguish between these two distinct senses of substance. But that he was fully aware of their difference cannot be doubted. Substance, he

¹ Cf. Shemtob Ibn Falaquera, *Moreh Ha-Moreh*, pp. 129-30, where this point is made in the clearest possible terms. S. B. Scheyer, in his *Das Psychologische System des Maimonides* (1845), pp. 41 ff., suggests that Maimonides' rejection of the objective existence of the universals (*Guide*, iii. 18) refers only to logical and mathematical concepts. This interpretation cannot be upheld.

² H. A. Wolfson, in his essay on "Crescas on the Problem of Divine attributes", *JQR*, N.S. vol. vii, suggests that Maimonides, in common with Avicenna and all his contemporaries, held that universals have both ideal and real existence. For prior to the rise of individual beings the universals existed in the mind of God as "independent entities". Even in essential attributes such as those which form a definition, plurality is implicit because genus and species which are the parts of the definition are "real in a certain sense". Wolfson suggests that Maimonides' rejection of essential attributes in God follows from this "realism" in regard to the universals, and that the problem of Divine attributes in both Islamic and Jewish philosophy is "a problem of universals in disguise". In our view, Wolfson's thesis cannot be upheld for two reasons. In the first place, existence in the mind of God does not constitute reality, not even a "certain" reality in the sense of "independent entity". Secondly, Maimonides repudiates the definition of God not because the two elements of a definition, i.e. genus and difference, are real entities but because "there are no previous causes to His existence by which he could be defined" (i. 52). Cf. Munk, *Guide*, i. 190, n. 3, where the Aristotelian sources of this argument are given. In our opinion, the problem of the Divine attributes has nothing to do with the problem of the universals.

says, has two senses: "the ultimate subject, which cannot be further predicated of something else; and whatever has an individual and separate existence", i.e. the essence of a thing (v. iii. 4). "Substance", he says in another context, "is of two kinds, the concrete thing and the formula" (vii. xv. 1). This broadly corresponds with the distinction between primary and secondary substance laid down in the *Categories* (ch. 5). Aristotle designates as "primary substances" the things "which are neither predicated of a substrate nor found in a substrate, e.g. this man or this horse". He describes as "secondary substances" the genera and species. The designation of the concrete thing as "primary substance" makes it clear that being attaches primarily to the particular thing, not to essence. In the *Metaphysics* too, Aristotle speaks of the concrete individual as "substance in the highest degree" (vii. vi. 2). On the other hand, he regards the concrete thing as inferior in being to the essence. It admits of generation and destruction whilst essence does not. "The essence of house is not generated, but only the essence of *this* house" (vii. xv. 1). He adds that for this reason there is no definition or demonstration of particular sensible substances, because they contain matter "whose nature is such that it can both exist and not exist" (vii. xv. 2). One has therefore to realize the paradoxical fact that the primary substance, i.e. the concrete thing, exists and has its being by virtue of its endowment with secondary substance, i.e. essence. Concrete individuals are perishable (vii. xv. 2). "Once they have passed from the sphere of actuality it is uncertain whether they exist or not, but they are always spoken of and apprehended by the universal formula" (vii. x. 18). We may therefore say of essence that whilst it exists only in concrete things and never by itself, it has nevertheless being and unity in a higher degree than the concrete thing. On the other hand, the concrete thing is substance in the truest sense, and existence belongs to it absolutely and primarily. Yet its existence is but the result of a particular matter achieving its form, and therefore dependent upon a specific set of causes. It is due to a process of generation which means "inducing form or essence into particular matter" (vii. viii. 4).

If one bears in mind Aristotle's dual approach to the problem of substance, one will not be surprised by Maimonides' definition of the relationship between essence and existence as stated in the opening paragraph of this paper. It has to be noted that Maimonides describes existence as an accident not to essence—no statement is made as to the being or non-being of essence *qua* essence—but to “that which exists”, i.e. the concrete thing. This we interpret to mean that the existence of a concrete thing composed of matter and form is due to the fact that, as a result of a causal process, a certain form has been induced into a certain matter. The term “accident” merely expresses the fact that the thing “happens” to exist. In a certain sense it also means that the essence “happens” to appear in this particular matter. It does not indicate that a non-existent or ideal essence has become “existent” by the grace of the accidental attribute of existence. Nor does it obliterate the recognition of concrete substances as having existence in a primary and absolute sense. It merely defines existence as being due to factors outside the essence, and for this reason uses the term “accident”. As Dr. Rahman has suggested, Avicenna employed the same term in a similar sense, and it is not unlikely that this is the way in which Maimonides understood Avicenna.

A closer analysis of Maimonides' definition of existence will bear out the correctness of our interpretation. From the statement quoted it is obvious that to exist is, in Maimonides' view, tantamount to being caused. Only in the case of God is existence uncaused. But precisely for this reason the term “existence” is used homonymously of God and all other beings (*Guide*, i. 56). The efficient cause, Maimonides states in his *Treatise on Logic* (ix. 3), is He who causes form to exist in matter, that is to say God. The philosophers, he adds, are in agreement with this, except that they regard God as a remote agent and seek for every existing being that is created its proximate agent. Seeing that the efficient cause is invariably outside the essence,¹ it is understandable that existence is described as an “accident superadded to the essence of that which exists”. The proximity of this view to Alfarābī's and Avicenna's

¹ Cf. *Met.* vii, viii; Gabirol, *Fons Vitae*, v. 24.

is too obvious to need much emphasis. The "that", says Alfārābī, does not derive from the "what" but from something external to the "what".¹ In other words, existence is due to an external agent. It does not derive from the essence as such. Both Alfārābī and Avicenna use the phrase that "considered in themselves and apart from their relation to the necessary Being, essences deserve privation of being".² Maimonides does not go as far as that. He does not designate essence as a mere possible in itself, but he agrees that existence in the sense of an "instantiation" of essence is a happening due to an agent outside the essence.

There is another aspect to the accidentality which Maimonides attributes to existence. To exist means to be actual. But everything that passes from a state of potentiality to that of actuality is caused to do so by some external agent (*Guide*, ii, Introduction, Prop. xviii). It follows that existence is due to some external agent, and therefore accidental to the thing itself. We may also say that existence is merely potential being as long as certain conditions are as yet unfulfilled. Maimonides calls this element of uncertainty surrounding the actualization of the potential a "possibility". "Everything that exists", he says, "and whose essence includes a certain state of possibility ('imkān) may at some time be without actual existence" (Prop. xxiii). In his Letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon, he explains that there is a difference between potentiality and possibility which to grasp requires great subtlety and is a matter of utmost difficulty even to trained philosophers.³ It appears that the possibility of which he speaks refers to the as yet unrealized presence of the conditions necessary for the actualization of a potential being. What Avicenna and the Latin schoolmen called *potentiae remotae* as distinct from *potentiae proximae* lies in the same direction.⁴ But neither Aristotle nor Avicenna

¹ Cf. Alfārābī, *Ringstones of Wisdom*, ed. Dieterici, p. 67 (110).

² Cf. Alfārābī, loc. cit. ; Avicenna, *Metaphysics*, viii, 6, quoted by E. Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers* (1949), p. 78.

³ Cf. *Kohez Teshubot ha-Rambam we-Iggerotaw*, ii, 27b.

⁴ For the Aristotelian source of this distinction, cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle*, pp. 691-2. Hillel of Verona, in his Commentary on the Twenty-Five Propositions of Maimonides (*Tagmule Ha-Nefesh*, Lyck

differentiate between potentiality and possibility.¹ According to Maimonides—if we understand him correctly—the element of possibility is bound up with external causation, whereas potentiality is the as yet unrealized being of the thing as such. Maimonides says distinctly, “A thing which owes its existence to certain causes has in itself (lit. in consideration of its essence) merely the possibility of existence” (Prop. XIX). Again, existence is seen to be purely accidental from the aspect of essence. In the case of God, existence is not merely actual but necessary. This is brought out in Maimonides’ Fourth Argument for the existence of God, which from the impossibility of an infinite regress postulates the existence of a cause which is pure actuality and admits of no potentiality whatever (*Guide*, ii. 1). “In the essence of this Cause nothing exists potentially, for if its essence included any possibility of existence it would not exist at all.” It should be noted that Maimonides is not content to exclude from God potentiality but that he excludes possibility as well. A being devoid of potentiality is actual—such is the God of Aristotle—but a Being free from possibility as well must be necessarily existent. Maimonides defines it as Being “that includes no possibility whatever but exists actually by its own essence”. In God, therefore, essence and existence are one.

There is yet a third aspect to Maimonides’ view concerning the nature of existence. To exist is to be willed by God. It is not enough to say that existence is caused by God. For that might imply an existence which necessarily derives from Him in the same manner “as the shadow is caused by a body, or heat by fire, or light by the sun” (*Guide*, ii. 2).² But Maimonides holds the world to be created by design (*ḳaṣd*) and

(1874), pp. 38a-39a) offers a different interpretation. He explains that the potentiality of a substratum to become X implies (a) a natural disposition, (b) a general possibility, whilst (c) the potentiality of X (e.g. the man being potentially in the seed) is pure potentiality: being as yet non-existent, the X has neither disposition nor possibility.

¹ The term *δύναμις* in Aristotle denotes both potentiality and possibility. As to Avicenna, cf. M. Horten, *Metaphysik des Avicenna*, p. 25.

² Two of these examples occur also in Maimonides’ *Aphorisms* (Fuṣūl Musa). Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Al-Farabi* (1869), p. 236.

determination (taḥṣiṣ) (ibid). The best proof for design in the universe he finds in the different motions of the spheres which cannot be explained as the necessary results of differences in their substance. One substance is common to all spheres, and yet each one has its own particular form, i.e. kind of movement and velocity. Who then, he asks, determined and pre-disposed these spheres to receive different forms? The answer he puts forward is: The Will of God (*Guide*, ii. 19). If one assumed "Nature" as such to operate without any voluntary determination, the "Wisdom" of God would be equivalent to Nature, and the essences of things would achieve existence in accordance with causal necessity. But the fact is that existence does not follow a plain and intelligible pattern. It contains an opaque, irrational element, as we might say. It points to "Will" as a determining factor besides "Wisdom". It appears that on the whole Maimonides related essence to the Wisdom, and existence to the Will of God, although he is rather vague in his utterances on the subject. He sometimes speaks of God's Wisdom as responsible for determinations which are rationally inexplicable (ii. 19), sometimes of "the Will of God or his Wisdom" (iii. 13), but it is clear that what he really means is Will, voluntary determination (cf. ii. 19). In God there is, of course, no duality of Will and Wisdom. They are both identical with His essence (i. 69; iii. 13). But the distinction is a valid one from the aspect of existing things. Their analysis reveals two distinct elements, i.e. essence which represents the realm of nature in the timelessness and constancy of being, and existence by which essence is thrown into combination with matter beyond the strict confines of causal necessity. Existence is thus from yet another angle accidental to essence. But its accidentality is now seen to derive from the Will of God. The final causes which Aristotle found in nature, Maimonides declares to terminate in the Will of God (i. 69; iii. 13). But God's Will is not arbitrary; it is guided by His Wisdom. "The object of His Will is only that which is possible, and of the things possible only such as His Wisdom decrees upon" (iii. 25). The duality of essence and existence in all created beings therefore corresponds in a way to the Wisdom and Will of God.

Maimonides' concept of God's essence as the Unity of Wisdom and Will, marks his standpoint in the great controversy between Ash'ariyya and Mu'tazila as to whether Will or Wisdom operate in the workings of Divine Providence (cf. *Guide*, iii. 17). It seems to imply a compromise solution combining both features. But its real purport must be seen in the stand Maimonides takes in the larger controversy between Kalām and the philosophers. There the issue is that of creation. As Isaac Abravanel has pointed out, the issue is not between creation and non-creation but between creation by will and design or creation by necessity.¹ Creation by will and design as conceived by Kalām left no room for a realm of essence, and, vice versa, creation by necessity as conceived by the philosophers seemed to ignore the nature of existence. The theologians of Kalām refused to call God the First Cause and designated Him either as Agent (fā'il) or Determinant (muḥaṣṣiṣ).² Maimonides assumes an intermediate position. He does not share the rejection of the term "Cause" for God (i. 69), and, at the same time, adopts the Kalām notion of taḥṣīṣ which expresses the concept of will and design. He recognizes most clearly that the denial by Kalām of the "true nature", i.e. the essences, of things stems from a desire to prove the determination (taḥṣīṣ) of things (ii. 19). He, on his part, accepts the theory of taḥṣīṣ but wishes to demonstrate the operation of this principle in the natural universe. He does not wish to disregard the "nature of things", i.e. their essences. In the view of Kalām, the principle of taḥṣīṣ determines the composition, size, place, accident, and time of the spheres and the sublunar beings (cf. *Guide*, i. 74, Fifth Argument). Maimonides restricts the operation of taḥṣīṣ to the spheres and admits it only indirectly to the sublunar world.³ But once the principle of voluntary determination is established, the universe as a whole is proved to be created.

Moses of Narbonne, in his *Commentary* on the *Guide*, passes the remark that Maimonides' arguments for creation by will and design were taken over from Ghazālī; moreover, that

¹ Cf. *Shamayim Hadashim*, ed. Heidenheimer (1828), p. 1b.

² Cf. *Guide*, i. 69; S. Pines, *Beiträge zur Islamischen Atomenlehre* (1936), p. 38.

³ Abravanel, loc. cit., pp. 2b-3.

they did not represent Maimonides' esoteric view but were meant merely to please the religionists. In his own generation one could safely agree with Averroes that all causality was determined by the nature of existing things, i.e. by the pure causality of form in the case of simple bodies, and by a combination of formal and efficient causes in the case of composite bodies.¹ Averroes does indeed eliminate the voluntaristic concept of final causes. He defines the Will of God as "the process of necessary action accompanied by knowledge".² Spinoza went even beyond that by denying both the Will and Intellect of God. He thus eliminated the final causes, and reduced the formal cause to the efficient cause.³ Maimonides, on the other hand, upholds efficient, formal and final causes. There is no justification for the view expressed by Moses of Narbonne that Maimonides' arguments for creation by design were not meant seriously. As we have seen, there is a close correspondence between Maimonides' ontology of essence and existence on the one hand, and his theology of Wisdom and Will on the other.

How far Maimonides succeeded in establishing the voluntaristic principle is another matter. The question is: To what extent is the Will of God free to operate in a world already determined by essences, i.e. formal causes? Moses of Narbonne had said that Maimonides' arguments for the principle of *taḥṣīṣ* were borrowed from Ghazālī. Abravanel strongly repudiates this contention. Ghazālī, he asserts, furnished only the first of Maimonides' arguments.⁴ But this is beside the point. The question is: Does Maimonides follow the whole trend of Ghazālī's argumentation? The answer to this is in the negative. Ghazālī wished to disprove formal causality altogether, and to replace it by the causality of Will alone. In full accord with Ash'arite Kalām, he denies the concept of essence and all it implies, i.e. formal causality and the reality of the potential. There is no

¹ Cf. Moses of Narbonne, *Bi'ūr le-Sefer Moreh Neḥuḳīm*, ed. J. Goldenthal (1852), pp. 34a-b.

² Cf. S. van den Bergh, *Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroes*, Leiden (1924), p. 270.

³ Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *Spinoza*, pp. 316 ff.

⁴ Cf. Abravanel, loc. cit. p. 3a. The argument referred to is based on the fact that certain spheres move from east to west, others in the opposite direction. Cf. *Tahāfut*, i. 12.

such thing as a natural process of change, of becoming, and of matter receiving successive forms as a result of a predisposition to receive them. Existence is not the result of a series of formal and material determinations but arises from discrete acts of Will on the part of God. This position is a renewal of the Megaric doctrine which Aristotle had taken pains to repudiate (*Met.* ix. iii). Maimonides' Aristotelianism has no use for such a radical application of the voluntaristic principle. He firmly upholds the concept of essence and formal causality but admits for the translunar sphere, and thus indirectly also for the sublunar world, the principle of *taḥṣīṣ*. Existence thus becomes something both caused and willed. It is caught in a nexus of causality which has its First Cause in God. Existence is therefore, metaphysically speaking, an "accident", something that "happens" to occur, and not something determined by essence as such.

In the light of the afore-going interpretation of Maimonides' concept of essence and existence, the criticisms levelled against it by the commentators will be seen to fall to the ground.

(1) Shemtob Ibn Falaquera (*Moreh Ha-Moreh*, p. 28) does not expressly criticise Maimonides but adduces by way of comment Averroes' critique of Avicenna and obviously wishes to apply it to Maimonides. He quotes Averroes as saying that "Our statement that a thing exists does not indicate something superadded to its essence *extra mentem* as would be the case in our stating that the thing is white. We found, however, that Avicenna mistakenly believed that unity is something superadded to the essence, and likewise existence, whenever we say that a thing exists; and that, moreover, an existing thing has no existence by virtue of its essence. This statement is most misleading, for it implies that the term 'existent' signifies an accident common to all categories *extra mentem*, which is the opinion of Avicenna. Concerning this 'accident' the question is asked whether in saying that it (sc. this accident) exists, we refer to the truth of the matter or to another accident existing in that (first) accident, in which case there would be an infinite series of accidents, which is absurd."

It is obvious that the target of Averroes' attack is the view supposedly held by Avicenna that existence is an accident like

whiteness. The fallacy of this assumption has been demonstrated by Dr. Rahman. The concrete individual thing "happens" to exist, but its existence is not an "accident" like quality or quantity. Averroes' argument that such an "accident" would be common to all categories does not therefore apply.¹ The other argument from the impossibility of an infinite series of accidents is a favourite one, and occurs in a number of medieval Jewish authors such as Joseph ben Jehudah Ibn Aḳnīn, Isaac Albalag, Gersonides and Hasdai Crescas.² Aristotle employs a similar argument to prove the absurdity of separating a thing from its essence (*Met.* VII, vi. 11-12). Again, the argument has no *locus standi* if the "accidental" nature of existence is interpreted as a "happening" due to a causal process.

(2) Moses of Narbonne (*Bi'ūr Narbonī*, p. 9a) reproaches Maimonides for having failed to distinguish between two fundamentally different senses of "being" to which Aristotle had already drawn attention, and which had been stressed anew by Averroes. Unfortunately, he says, Avicenna had ignored this distinction, and Maimonides had blindly followed him. "To be" and "is" may, according to Aristotle, sometimes mean that a thing is true, and "not to be" that it is false (*Met.* v. vii.; vi. ii.). In another sense, being attaches to the "what" of a thing, that is to say, primarily to substance and in a secondary sense to the other categories as well. For in asking what quality "is", we are using the term "is" in a different sense. We may even say that not-being is not-being (*Met.* iv. ii. 3; vii. iv. 12-13). "The senses of essential being are those which are indicated by the figures of predication (i.e. the categories): for being has as many senses as there are ways of predication" (*Met.* v. vii. 4).³ Likewise, Averroes says that "being" is a term "used for the true, i.e. that which being

¹ For a more elaborate account of this particular argument cf. *Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroes*, ed. S. van den Bergh, pp. 8-9.

² Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *JQR*, N.S. vii.

³ Cf. Franz Brentano, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles* (1862), p. 85: "Die Kategorien sind verschiedene Bedeutungen des ὄν." See also Sir W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, i. 307: "Thus Being is not a genus common to the various senses of being but has a different meaning in the various categories."

in mente agrees with what is *extra mentem*”, and is used also “for that which has quiddity and essence *extra mentem*, irrespective as to whether this essence is conceived or not”. “Hence the term ‘being’ is reduceable to these two senses, i.e. the true and that which is *extra mentem*” (*Epitome*, ed. v.d. Bergh, p. 7; cf. *Met.* vi. iv.).

Moses of Narbonne makes the point that Maimonides’ failure to distinguish between the uses of the term “is” in the sense of “being true” on the one hand and of the being of the categories on the other prevented him from realizing the essential character of categorial being. For only when using the term “is” in the sense of “being true” do we separate being from essence, whilst in the other case essence and existence are inseparable. Aristotle does indeed say that “existent man” and “man” are the same thing. The duplication in the statement “He is a man and an existent man” yields no fresh meaning (*Met.* iv. ii. 7). Essence has intrinsic being. But Maimonides nowhere disputes this view. He is not concerned with the mode of being that attaches to essence but with the existence of concrete things.

(3) Asher ben Abraham Crescas, in his *Commentary* on the *Guide* (i. 57), identifies Maimonides’ view with Avicenna’s and quotes Averroes’ refutation of it. “Avicenna supposed existence to be an accident, his argument being as follows: If existence signified the essence (‘aẓmūt), the statement, ‘substance exists’ would be equivalent to the statement, ‘substance is substance’. Averroes, however, argued against him that ‘existence’ is spoken of in regard to essence and to being true, as e.g. in the statement, ‘The man is existent or non-existent’, as well as in the sense of the copula (ḳeshet), as e.g. in the statement ‘The man is (nimẓa) righteous. Hence ‘being’ applies to substance essentially (bē-‘aẓmūt) and to the other categories *secundum prius et posterius* (bi-ḳēdīmāh we-’ihūr); not homonymously (bē-shitūf) nor as a *nomen appellativum* (bē-haṣḳamah) but *secundum prius et posterius*. It applies to substance absolutely (bē-‘amitūt) and to each other category according to the nature thereof.”

Avicenna’s argument quoted in the above context occurs, as Dr. Rahman was good enough to inform the present writer, in

the *Kitāb al-Shifā'*, *Met.*, Maḳāla, 1, Fuṣl, 5, and reads as follows : " It is certain that the peculiar essence of everything is different from its being, i.e. its determinate existence. This is the case because if you say, ' such and such an essence exists ' . . . your statement yields a definite and intelligible meaning ; but if you say (which you *would* say if you equated essence and existence), ' essence is essence ', it would be a superfluous and unprofitable talk." What Avicenna means to convey is, according to Dr. Rahman, the following. (1) In asserting existential propositions of individual objects, we add nothing to the subject of which existence is asserted, and hence any such affirmation is " unprofitable ". (2) If, however, we assert existence of quiddities such as " elephant " by saying, " elephant exists ", the affirmation of existence is " profitable " because it yields some fresh information about reality. The proposition, " elephant exists " is equivalent to the proposition, " there exists an instance (or there exist instances) of elephant ". Existence in such cases means " instantiation ". The distinction between essence and existence does, however, not imply that existence is an accident in the logical sense of accident as opposed to substance and attached to it, as it were, from the outside.¹

Whilst Asher ben Crescas quotes Avicenna's argument correctly, Averroes seems to present it in a slightly different form. In the *Epitome* of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (ed. S. van den Bergh, p. 8) we read as follows : " It was argued that if the term ' being ' signified the essence, the statement, ' substance exists ' would be self-contradictory ". The same version of the argument occurs also in Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation,² from which Jacob Mantinus made his Latin translation in the sixteenth century. Unfortunately, the present writer was unable to consult the editions of the two Arabic MSS. (Cairo and Madrid) used by Dr. van den Bergh. It is, however, generally agreed that the Hebrew translation is more reliable than the Cairo MS.³ It broadly corresponds with the Madrid MS.

¹ The above summary of Dr. Rahman's interpretation follows closely the text of his paper on " Essence and Existence in Avicenna ".

² Cf. Bodleian Library, MS. Can. Or. 63 (Neubauer 1377. 3), fol. 154 a.

³ Cf. *Philosophical Essays* by Isaac Husik, ed. by Milton C. Nahm and Leo Strauss (1952), pp. 162-3.

This would lead us to assume that the text before us is genuine, and that Averroes in fact misrepresented the true meaning of Avicenna. On the other hand, Asher ben Crescas' re-statement of Avicenna's and Averroes' respective arguments appears to be a paraphrase of the relevant passages in the *Epitome* (cf. pp. 8, 28-9 in van den Bergh's edition). This would indicate that he had before him an Averroes text offering the correct version of Avicenna's argument.

Asher ben Crescas also briefly summarizes Averroes' statement that existence applies to substance essentially and to the other categories *secundum prius et posterius*, i.e. *analogice* as distinct from *aequivoce* and *univoce* (*Epitome*, p. 28). This view goes back to Aristotle who, speaking of the senses of "being" as related to the categories, made it clear that that which is primarily and absolutely is substance, and that the "being" of the other categories, whilst still essential, is not primary. How then was it permissible to use the term "being" in such a variety of senses? Aristotle's answer is that "we use the terms neither equivocally nor in the same sense, but just as we use the term 'medical' in *relation* to one and the same thing; but not *of* one and the same thing, nor yet equivocally. The term 'medical' is applied to a body and a function and an instrument, neither equivocally nor in one sense, but in relation to one thing" (*Met.* VII. iv. 12-16; IV. ii. 2). Essential being thus has "ten ultimate meanings or colourings answering to the ten ultimate kinds of things" (cf. Sir W. D. Ross, *ibid*). But it has to be borne in mind that whilst "to be a quality" is indeed an essential mode of being, "to be white" is accidental being. Likewise, the concrete individual thing, with which Maimonides is concerned, has not essential but accidental being.

(4) Shemtob ben Joseph, in his *Commentary* on the *Guide* (I. 57), mentions four arguments which, in his view, induced Maimonides to hold the opinion that existence is an accident:

(a) We conceive the quiddity of things and may still remain in doubt as to their existence. Hence existence is something additional to essence. This argument reflects a line of thought pursued by Alfārābī in his *Ringstones of Wisdom* (ed. Dieterici, pp. 108-9).

(b) Essence is not caused, but we say *that* man exists, and ask *why* he exists. Hence existence cannot belong to essential things. In other words, the questions "why?" and "whether?" do not properly belong to essence. They apply only to existence. It follows that existence cannot be essential. This argument reflects Aristotle's distinction as to the four possible questions: *Whether* a thing is such and such ($\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\omicron\tau\iota$); *why* it is such and such ($\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$); *whether it exists* ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$); and *what* it is ($\tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$) (*Anal. Post.* 2.1). "After the existence of a thing is known to us, we enquire as to its whatness in asking, e.g. 'What, then, is God?', or, 'What is man?'" (loc. cit.). Here Aristotle himself distinguishes between essence and existence as related to two different kinds of questions.¹ But in the same way in which Aristotle fails to draw the inference that existence must be accidental, Maimonides, too, may have left it at that.

(c) "Existence" is a term which can be used neither as a *nomen appellativum*, i.e. *secundum prius et posterius*, nor homonymously. Hence it must be used as a hybrid term (i.e. one denoting common accidental characteristics).² But seeing that hybrid terms denote accidental characteristics, and no accidental characteristics apply to God, it follows that the term "existence" which is applied to all beings cannot be used of God. This argument need not be taken seriously at all, since it begs the question. It pre-supposes the accidental character of existence instead of proving it. On the other hand, it does reflect Maimonides' view that the term "existence" cannot be used *analogice* of God and all other beings. But Maimonides describes the term as a homonymous one, and not merely as a hybrid.

(d) "Know thou that every agent, especially one endowed with intellect, must necessarily conceive the essence of the thing (i.e. which he produces) before it comes into existence. Take, e.g. a house which existed in the mind of the architect: it is the cause of the existence of the house existing *extra mentem*. Now, since all things exist by virtue of the First Cause who knows them, it follows that the quiddity of the thing exists prior

¹ This fourfold division is used by Gabirol for a fourfold classification of ontological levels. Cf. *Fons Vitae*, v. 24.

² Cf. Maimonides' *Treatise on Logic*, ch. xiii.; *Guide*, Introduction.

to its existence. Hence existence is an accident to quiddity." This argument merely proves that the essences of things, i.e. the universals exist in the Mind of God, a view which is totally different from the one which describes existence as an accident. That the Platonic Forms exist in the Mind of God was already stated in Middle-Platonism, Neo-Pythagoreanism and Philo of Alexandria. But it did not there carry the connotation of existence as a mere accident of essence.

Shemtov completely fails to produce evidence that the above arguments had in fact weighed with Maimonides. He himself brushes these arguments aside by declaring that essence and existence are one. Like his predecessors, he joins the camp of Averroes. Like them, he seems to have misunderstood the real purport of Maimonides' concept. As we have seen, Maimonides remains firmly planted on Aristotelian ground.

In his *Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development* (Oxford, 1934), Werner Jaeger has suggested that there are three different conceptions of the nature of Metaphysics underlying the different strata of the corpus of Aristotelian writings to which, probably by Andronicus, the name of *Metaphysics* was given in some complete edition in the Hellenistic age. They are (1) the earliest "theological" concept which replaces Plato's supersensible Forms by the unmoved Mover, and sees the problems of Metaphysics against a Platonic background; (2) the concept of Metaphysics as the science of Being as such in the sense that it enquires into the kinds of Being uncritically assumed by the sciences; (3) Metaphysics as Ontology, describing the various senses of Being, including sensible as well as supersensible substance, and aiming at a morphology of Being (loc. cit. p. 387).

The medieval definitions of the aims of Metaphysics faithfully reflect these levels of meaning. Thus Alfārābī's "Catalogue of Sciences" (*Ihsā' al-ulūm*)¹ subdivides Metaphysics into (1) the science which investigates Being *qua* Being; (2) the science

¹ Quoted in L. Gardet-M. M. Anawati, *Introduction à la Théologie Musulmane* (Paris, 1948), p. 103.

which investigates the principles of the particular sciences ; and (3) the science which investigates the supersensible beings. Similarly, Averroes assigns to Metaphysics the threefold task of examining (1) the sensible beings *qua* beings ; (2) the supersensible beings including God ; and (3) the principles of the particular sciences (cf. *Epitome*, pp. 4-5). Amongst Jewish authors, Shemtob Ibn Falaquera lists the same three branches of Metaphysics (cf. *Reshit Hokmah*, ed. M. David, Berlin, 1902, p. 53).¹ Maimonides, on the other hand, divides Metaphysics into two parts only : (1) into an investigation of all beings which are supersensible, i.e. God and the angels ; (2) into an inquiry into the principles (lit. remote causes) of the sciences (cf. *Treatise on Logic*, ch. xiv.). He entirely omits the ontological task of Metaphysics, i.e. the investigation of Being *qua* Being. Whilst Aristotle had moved away from the theological concept of Metaphysics towards the ontological one, Maimonides, in common with most of the Jewish metaphysicians, is primarily concerned with the theological aspect of Metaphysics. The ontological elements of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, in so far as they are made use of, now serve the purposes of theology. The concepts of matter and form, potentially and actuality are employed to this end. But Maimonides seems entirely to ignore Aristotle's investigation into the manifold senses of essential being. This central part of the Aristotelian ontology is left out of account altogether. It is here that Maimonides parts company with Aristotle. He does not repudiate the notion of a gradation of being according to the categories, but, being interested primarily in the theological angle, the different shades of being in all created beings are neutralized, as it were, and reduced to one single level compared with the totally other Being of God. The only ontological distinction which matters from the theological

¹ This definition of the objects of Metaphysics forms part of the classification of sciences introduced into Arabic philosophy through the translation of John Philoponus' Commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Sometimes, the Aristotelian scheme is mixed with the Platonic classification which identifies Metaphysics with Logic. Cf. H. A. Wolfson, *The Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*, HUCA Jubilee Volume, 1925 ; Leo Strauss, *Farabi's Plato*, Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, American Academy for Jewish Research (New York, 1945), pp. 389 ff.

point of view is the one between created and uncreated being. All created existence is caused, actualized from potentiality, and willed by God. The term "being" is therefore used homonymously of God and the created beings. Maimonides makes no use whatever of Aristotle's concept of the analogy of being on which Averroes laid such great stress, and which Alfārābī had already used to theological advantage. Both Alfārābī and Averroes had conceded the admissibility of applying the term "being" to God and created existence *secundum prius et posterius*. They held that God has being primarily and essentially while all other beings possess existence only in a derivative sense, i.e. derived from God. Alfārābī's view is clearly stated in his "The political Governments", a work well-known to Maimonides and highly praised by him in his Letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon.¹ It is all the more remarkable that Maimonides refrained from using Aristotle's concept of the analogy of being and insisted on the homonymous nature of the term. The reason for this attitude must be sought in his neo-platonic orientation which he shared with Avicenna. It was left to his more radically Aristotelian successor Gersonides to introduce the analogical concept of Being into Jewish theology, and thus to follow the lead given by Averroes. But even then the issue was not fully settled, as is apparent from Hasdai Crescas' attack on both Avicenna and Averroes, and his compromise suggestion that existence is neither accidental to essence nor identical with it but "essential" to it.

¹ Alfārābī's "The political Governments" was edited in Hyderabad in 1346, and appeared in a German translation ("Die Staatsleitung von Alfarabi") by Brömle, Leiden, 1904. We possess the work also in Samuel Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation under the title, *Sefer Hatalōt Ha-Nimza'ot* (ed. Zēbi Filipowski, Leipzig, 1849, in *Sefer He-'Asif*). The passage referred to in the text is found on p. 16 of this Hebrew edition. As to the significance of the work for an appraisal of Maimonides, cf. Leo Strauss, *Farabi's Plato*, pp. 357 ff.

THE HAIGH IRONWORKS, 1789 - 1856 : A NOBLE-MAN'S ENTERPRISE DURING THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION ¹

By ALAN BIRCH, M.A.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC HISTORY, THE UNIVERSITY, MANCHESTER

DURING the sixteenth century, when it might be truly said that the modern iron industry got under way (with the blast furnace superseding the old bloomery), "an ever increasing number of noblemen" were pioneers in exploiting the mineral wealth of England and Wales. T. S. Ashton, in his *Iron and Steel in the Industrial Revolution*,² gives a list, including, among others, the Queen, the Earls of Derby, Surrey and Northumberland. Later, however, again as Ashton points out, the intimate association between ironmaking and the ownership of land survived only in a much diluted form: "the landed proprietors had long ceased to participate in the industry directly, but they continued to provide much of the fixed capital by leasing mines of coal and ironstone and sometimes furnaces and forges to the active industrialists".³ When the association continued, it was the result of that reciprocal process—the rise of the new industrial gentry—when the nouveaux riches, the prosperous ironmasters, bought country seats and insinuated themselves into Society by marriage and other means. This rise in the status of the ironmaster was a marked feature of the social position of the second generation of industrialists in the

¹ I am greatly indebted to the Earl of Crawford, not only for his very kind permission to consult his private family papers at the John Rylands Library, Manchester, but also for his considerable interest in my work by critically reading through this article and correcting one or two errors of misinterpretation of the documents upon my part. However, I am responsible for all the deficiencies of this essay in industrial history.

My debt to Dr. F. Taylor of the library staff must also be acknowledged for his unobtrusive work as archivist and editor which so much lightened the work of research and publication.

² 2nd edn., 1951, p. 5.

³ *Ibid.* p. 209.

first half of the nineteenth century. As far as the iron industry was concerned, the ultimate result of this tendency was for the ironmaster to disappear as such and to be replaced by the technician, the manager and financier-investor.

Nevertheless, there were one or two "true-born aristocrats" who played an active part in the industrial enterprise. A list of furnaces and their proprietors drawn up in 1805 shows furnaces owned and worked by Earl Gower in Shropshire, and the Earl of Balcarres at Haigh, near Wigan in Lancashire.¹

This article is concerned with the early history of the Haigh ironworks and, in particular, its aim is to illustrate the rôle of its titled entrepreneur by means of quotations from surviving business records of the firm.² Since these are by no means complete, it has not been possible to present a coherent and detailed history of the development of the ironworks.

The iron and steel industry of Lancashire today is largely the product of a renewed burst of activity (following the adoption of the Bessemer converter process) in the eighteen sixties. In the Furness district in north Lancashire it is true that the charcoal industry survived after passing its peak of production in the eighteenth century, but here, as in south Lancashire, the iron industry was to make a new beginning. On the Wigan coalfield itself, it was in 1858 that the large Kirklees Hall ironworks were erected to smelt iron ore from Ulverston, coke being obtained from the local source, although it had to be expensively and slowly washed to remove excessive sulphur. By 1867 there were ten furnaces in operation with an output of over 70,000 tons of iron a year.³

However, during the intervening period, when Lancashire was more important as a source of iron ore to the other smelting districts,⁴ the manufacturing and finishing side of the industry flourished. Among the several examples which could be cited

¹ Boulton and Watt MSS. (Assay Office, Birmingham).

² Earl of Crawford Papers (Haigh MSS. in the John Rylands Library).

³ F. Kohn, *Iron and Steel Manufacture* (London, 1869), pp. 20-1.

⁴ In *The Torrington Diaries*, ed. C. B. Andrews, i. 24 it was noted in the 1781 Tour to the West, when speaking of Tintern Abbey, "All the iron ore is brought from Lancs. . . ."

of this development¹ was the Haigh ironworks itself. It was, in fact, as a foundry and forge that Haigh first comes to our notice. The real mineral wealth of Wigan and district was the famous "cannel" coal, remarked upon by travellers from the time of Leland in the sixteenth century onwards.² There was some iron ore to be found, but it was not of sufficient quality to persuade any industrialist to build a blast furnace in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. However, pig-iron (obtainable perhaps from Shropshire and Cheshire via Liverpool, or the Furness area) was to be had at an economic cost to supply the neighbouring coal-pits with castings and forgings. In 1766 the sale of a forge on the river Douglas one mile from Wigan was advertised in a Liverpool paper.³ This almost certainly was the Brock Mill Forge. A few years later, in 1775, another sale was advertised by the assignee of a Mr. James of Wigan, a bankrupt.⁴ As we shall see, it was an existing foundry which was taken over by the Earl of Balcarres.

The Earl of Balcarres (1752-1825) was all that one expects an eighteenth century peer to have been. His descent, it goes without saying, was of an illustrious line. He himself, after a continental education,—not the usual Grand Tour, it is true, but two years at Göttingen University—made the Army his career. By 1789 he had risen to the rank of Colonel of the 63rd foot, and during the threat of Napoleonic invasion of this country was in command of the forces in Jersey with the rank of Major General.⁵ This episode and his subsequent

¹ Others were Hannah Lees and Sons at Ashton under Lyne, and the Dallam Forge established in 1840 at Warrington.

² See A. J. Hawkes, *Sir Roger Bradshaigh of Haigh* (Manchester 1943). Mr. Hawkes, to whom I am indebted for much valuable information about Haigh, gives a detailed account, based upon the Haigh Colliery orders, 1635-90, of the industrial activities of the Earl of Balcarres' predecessor. In 1678 there was a glass-making enterprise, but most important was the construction of the great sough, 1652-70 (chap. iii, pp. 13-20). See also the Earl of Crawford's paper to the Manchester Statistical Society, 1933, "Haigh Cannel".

³ *Williamsons' Liverpool Advertiser*, 28 November 1766.

⁴ *Gore's General Advertiser*, 5 May 1775. Mr. T. R. Harris kindly pointed out these references to me.

⁵ *D.N.B.*, Alexander, 6th Earl of Balcarres (1752-1825).

appointment as Governor of Jamaica from 1794 to 1801,¹ it has to be admitted, interrupted his career as an industrial entrepreneur. However, finally incapacitated from further military service on account of a lame leg, economic necessity forced him to recognize the need for "the improvement of his property" as the official history of the family succinctly puts it.² This property, which came to Balcarres as his wife's inheritance in Lancashire, obliged him to become an "improving landlord" of necessity, "the mansion house being in ruins, the furniture sold—the mines of coal and cannel forsaken, the lands undrained and every farmhouse and fence in the last stage of decay."³ Thus it was that, as a beginning to the exploitation of the great potential wealth of the estate, he entered into a partnership in 1788 (20 August) with one James Corbett, an ironfounder in Wigan.⁴ The foundry was sold to the partnership for £400 and the new company, which was also to include Robert Lindsay, the Earl of Balcarres' brother (at that time in India), was to set up furnaces at "Lalland Mill within Haigh", as part of an integrated concern together with the Brock Mill Forge, or, as it appears in the original, "when the same should be compleated they and the said iron foundry should be thrown together and carried on to such an extent as the scheme would admitt of". The ownership of the concern was to be divided in the following manner: The Earl of Balcarres, 5 parts, James Corbett, 3 parts, Robert Lindsay, 4 parts.⁵

¹ Cf. G. H. Tupling, "The Early Metal Trades and the Beginnings of Engineering in Lancashire", *Trans. Lancs. and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, vol. lxi, 1949. He says the Earl left Haigh in 1798, and the furnace was abandoned and the works turned over to the manufacture of shot and shell. See below for a correction of this statement.

² Lord Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays*, ii (London, 1849), 360.

³ *Ibid.* p. 361.

⁴ The Earl also developed the coalmines again, selling coal by means of the Liverpool-Leeds canal in Liverpool and Lancaster. This side of the business activities of the estate is not dealt with in this paper, although it is certain they were by far the most remunerative of his activities. The deed of partnership unfortunately could not be traced among the Haigh muniments. It is recited, however, in substance, in the Contract dissolving the partnership, 1791.

⁵ Robert Lindsay, it appears, at first withdrew, and then later consented to become a partner. There was no mention, it seems, of the amount of capital to be paid into the concern by the partners.

The partnership, then, represented a typical alliance between landed, technical and commercial capital. For Robert Lindsay was by experience and training the vital man to the success of the concern. As a younger son, he had been put into trade, in fact, the service of the East India Company. "He went out as a writer to the East Indies, but without any help to forward his views (other) than his own genius."

In India he put his genius to practical use, building up a fortune for himself in the course of an eventful and versatile career as "soldier, magistrate, political agent, farmer, ornamental gardener, elephant-catcher, tiger-hunter, ship-builder, lime manufacturer, physician and surgeon!" Thus "having in his line the quickness of a projector", as the official history describes this business instinct, the success of the Haigh concern would seem to have been assured if Lindsay had played an active part in the building up of the ironworks.

In fact, Lindsay, returning to this country to enjoy his retirement, was reluctant to live at Haigh and take upon his shoulders the responsibility of managing the works, but all the same, he was dragged in to get the works under way. Corbett, the original owner of the foundry, it appears, was full of grandiose schemes for expansion, including setting up a boring mill to manufacture cannon. In June, 1789, he wrote to the Earl: "I am now making the pit, building [a] large receiving furnace and getting forward with the Boring Mill, which I will now venture to say shall not be equalled by any in the Kingdom. It will be constructed [so] as to bore seven cylinders of different diameters or six pieces of cannon at one time."¹ However, he died in 1790, leaving the plan to outstrip John Wilkinson, the great ironmaster of the day, unfinished. What is more, the contract previously quoted reveals that "the said business having been carried on for some time under the management of the said James Corbett, it was found upon his decease that he had conducted them with great want of economy and that they had cost a much more considerable sum than they ought to have done". This state of affairs was to be endemic with several managers.

¹ James Corbett—Earl of Balcarres, June 1789.

In contrast to this neglect of the appointed managers, however, several letters in the Balcarres collection from Lindsay to his brother show that despite Lindsay's affirmation that he knew nothing of the business, his natural energy and practical ability were devoted to reorganizing the concern. Finding that most of the men had left the sinking ship, he "engaged an overseer for one twelve-month, his name—John Coward, who at present has the management of the Duckinfield works . . . he is perfectly master of the Manchester business".¹ Also, he got his brother to recruit moulders from Scotland. The recruiting and handling of labour—in fact, disciplining hands into an efficient working force—was one of the chief concerns of the industrialist of this period, and there are several pieces of evidence in the correspondence to support this statement. On 20 July 1790, Robert Lindsay was writing: "yesterday warned off Sam Furnace for getting drunk upon his post, which had nearly played the devil with the machinery. In a few days I expect to have all our best people bound down for three years; this has required vast manoeuvring."² Other essential acts of reconstruction were not neglected. He repaired the weir, got the building of the casting house under way, as well as tenements for the men and stables for the horses. He showed an intelligent interest in the metallurgical side of the business. He experimented with the different varieties of coal and ironstone available locally in the two blast furnaces (built 1789-90) and tried the method of casting direct from the furnace, as the following extracts from his reports show:

1. "Our metal is again excellent but very much in a state of fluctuation from some unknown cause—last week gave us near 15 tons—the furnace without doubt works best with about 2/3rd portion Bath and 1/3rd Brock miln stone." (20 July 1790.)

2. "The Black Brock Mill stone, hitherto universally condemned and with which they talked of repairing the roads, proves by much the best stone we have—the metal came down this morning, of an excellent quality and much kished,

¹ Robert Lindsay—Earl of Balcarres, 5 June 1790.

² Robert Lindsay—Earl of Balcarres, 20 July 1790. A later manager complained not of drunkenness, which, perhaps, was all too common, but of the harm caused by the wife of one of the keepers with her intriguing, profligacy and sabotage (by putting sulphur in the furnace). A. Haliburton—Earl of Balcarres, 21 August 1806.

which has not been the case for two or three months . . . several other things that I have lately tried have succeeded well, particularly in the casting of goods from the blast instead of running the metal a considerable distance as hitherto. It goes into a hole at the mouth of the furnace by a gentle stream and from thence [is] carried bit and bit as it comes out to the different moulds and a proper arrangement of carriers fixt beforehand to prevent confusion—this answers prodigiously—for many days we have not run a pig of metal.” (16 July 1790.)

3. “. . . I have engaged as many hands as I think we can employ for the present . . . by degrees we shall weed until we can get a set of good hands. . . . I shall push on the building rapidly to be ready when the people come. If the loam moulder does not answer my expectations I will let you know. Our furnace is again doing well. If it is now evident that she requires to have the dust drawn out frequently, we begin likewise to be much better acquainted with the materials.” (14 July [?] 1790.)

The final extract, however, makes it clear that the plan for moulding directly from the furnace had to be abandoned :

4. “After some experience and much observation upon the propriety of using the Blast metal I perceive clearly that we must soon drop the plan altogether except in cases of heavy goods [and] use only the metal from the air furnace . . . for we seldom fail to make a number of wasters owing to the coldness of the metal.

I am quite in love with the cupula [sic] for working up our scraps, of which we had a shameful quantity. This alone keeps all the moulders agoing, nor can they keep pace with it it melts so fast—I have known it charged 20 times a day.” (15 June [?] July] 1790.)

As a result of this attention, the concern, which at one time Balcarres was considering giving up, was firmly established and in 1790 (September) the following advertisement appeared in the Liverpool newspaper, *Gore's General Advertiser*: “The Hon. Robert Lindsay & Co. announce they have erected a Blast furnace and Boring mill at Haigh, offer services in Foundry business. Having engaged Engineers and able workmen, they are enabled to undertake the complete construction of Fire Engines of every kind.”

Nevertheless, in one respect Robert Lindsay's influence upon the works was to be almost disastrous. For, despite his work of reorganization, he was not reconciled to the idea of being tied to Haigh (perhaps because the Earl also was not prepared to become a tradesman); and in 1790, after an extensive correspondence, in which the two brothers haggled over the conditions under which Robert should be allowed to withdraw from the partnership, in September a formal deed of dissolution was drawn up and under this Lindsay appears to have paid heavily

for his freedom. He was to forfeit £3,000 of capital advanced in the concern and was to leave £7,000 as a loan, secured only by the works buildings and stock-in-trade.

This, however, it should be noted, did not clear up the matter, as negotiations dragged on until 1793. One complication was the claims of Corbett's widow (the wife of the deceased partner) upon the concern for a share in its uncertain profits.¹ This state of affairs is, of course, another example of the inconveniences of partnership which (apart from the rare Chartered Company, e.g. the Carron Company, chartered in 1773) was the only accessible form of joint stock investment then available to business entrepreneurs.

Since neither Lindsay nor the Earl wished to take upon themselves the burden of active management,² the problem of securing an honest, efficient manager was of the first importance to the prosperity of the enterprise. Indeed, in this matter the unreliability of the first manager (which, again, is a cause for reflection upon the development of industrial discipline and responsibility represented by the rise of the managerial class) nearly brought ruin to the concern.

¹ *Manchester Mercury*, 16 April 1793. "Haigh Iron Works. Partnership Dissolved. Notice is hereby given that the Co-partnership in the Ironworks erected on the estate of the Earl of Balcarres at Haigh . . . heretofore carried on by the Honourable Robert Lindsay, James Corbett, and the said Earl under the name of Lindsay, Corbett & Co., and which since the death of the said James Corbett hath been carried on by the said Robert Lindsay and Alice Corbett, widow, and the said Earl hath been this day . . . dissolved. Accounts to Mr. Alexander Halliburton, manager at Haigh. 21 March 1793.

Robert Lindsay.
Alice Corbett
Balcarres

The concern of Haigh Ironworks will be carried on in future under the firm of James Lindsay & Company."

² In January 1790, Lindsay made his point of view quite clear: ". . . now that the value of the metal and manufacture is so far established that the works can be disposed of in a manner so that you will reap a benefit from the concern instead of losing, it is high time to think of myself. I say disposed of with much reason, for unless the Merchants bestow their whole time and attention to a manufacture of this kind, where there is so much competition, it never can be productive but to the proprietor of the estate . . . you cannot suppose that I can make so great a sacrifice as to take up residence at Haigh nor can your rank of life admit your doing of it."

An engineer to the court of Bavaria, Joseph von Baader, came to England in 1789 or 1790. Very little is known of his connections with this country, which brought him here intermittently for a period of approximately eight years. At all events the Earl arranged for Baader to meet Robert Lindsay at Haigh. Now, not the least of Baader's assets was a very plausible tongue and an attractive personality.¹ He obviously impressed Lindsay with his ability to expound engineering matters and with his accounts of the reorganization he had carried out at the famous ironworks of Coalbrookdale as well as those of John Wilkinson. During his visit to Haigh, a letter tells us, he drew up a history of the works, which unfortunately is not with the papers which survive. We know his opinion of the Haigh ironworks, for what it is worth—"upon the whole he likes the situation of our works and pronounces that at a future day they will make a Figure—Hitherto he says every thing has been carried on in a style infinitely too expensive".² As this judgement confirmed the Earl's own ideas, particularly about the latter tendency, the young engineer made a favourable impression upon the two brothers. Baader did not take up the management of Haigh immediately—he came some time in 1791—but when he did, the result was the complete undoing of Lindsay's work of reorganization and he did nothing to alter the state of affairs which he had criticized earlier. Having caused

¹ At that time he was a pleasant young man of twenty-five, not a grumpy old German, as Lindsay expected.

² Robert Lindsay—Earl of Balcarres, n.d. There is an interesting sidelight upon the Earl of Balcarres' lack of business acumen in the Boulton & Watt papers (in letters, Bundle E, MIV) by P. Ewart, who describes several visits to the works: (In 1791) "On our arrival at the Ironworks we found Lord Balcarres to whom we introduced ourselves . . . he informed us he had laid out a great deal of money there, he believed to very little purpose, for he had been beset constantly by a set of rascally swindling schemers. . . . His Lordship, however, appeared to us to be rather a weak brother and was probably an easy prey to such gentlemen as he described. I remember Cooper [his companion on the visit] observed when we came away that he was certainly like a lord. His Lordship informed us, however, that he was then getting into a good train for he had engaged the best and most ingenious mechanic in the world, a person who had invented great improvements in the Steam Engine, Cotton Machine and everything else. This man was the great Doctor Baader." Letter to James Watt Junr. dated 27 July 1800 (a reference kindly supplied by Miss P. M. Giles).

offence to the English and Scottish workers, he introduced German carpenters and miners into the concern. According to the steward of the Earl, Donald McDonald, these underlings of Baader did nothing but smash the moulding patterns to make furniture for themselves, in the case of the carpenters, and the miners showed none of that industry which Baader had praised, but started the day's work as late and finished as early as possible. As for Baader himself, "he looks after nothing, nor cares not, as far as his deportment can be read, whether matters sink or swim".¹

It took some time, apparently, for the Earl to recognise what the true state of affairs was, but at last it became clear to him. "Contagion and destruction seems to follow his (Baader's) steps everywhere", he lamented; not without cause, for Reichenbach (Baader's associate) had dismantled the steam engine for the blast and left it in pieces. Thus Baader had Balcarres in his power. Unfortunately we do not know the exact details of Baader's departure from Haigh but it was only a question of the Earl resolving to dismiss him and to cut his losses on the misplaced confidence.

Another manager, Alexander Haliburton of Inverkeithing, Scotland, was appointed in January 1793, but of the progress of the works under his rule we have little evidence. From the manuscripts which survive it appears that his association with the Haigh ironworks lasted until 1823 or 1824, when the Earl compiled confidential notes upon his manager's incompetence. This was again a belated realization upon the part of the Earl of the consequences of a misplaced confidence. It was the anti-climax of a period of high hopes of an extension of the foundry's trade to the West Indies, supplying the plantations with sugar mills and steam engines. Haliburton had apparently weathered one crisis in 1808, a year of depression in the iron trade, and had managed to console His Lordship that "if these works are getting nothing—Smalley and others must be losing, and that consequently there will soon be less competition".² The works foundry was at that time reported to be "now complete in all patterns and other utensils, and adapted to all sorts,

¹ Donald McDonald—Earl of Balcarres, n.d.

² A. Haliburton—Earl of Balcarres, 12 July 1808.

large and small, and the style of the business, though not extensive, is established on pretty good grounds". More will be said of the financial state of the business later; however, the firm launched out into the new market in 1811. A circular giving the "Descriptive advantages of the Haigh ironworks", after informing the reader that they were favourably sited on the Liverpool Canal "as to admit delivery of goods in 24 hours" to Liverpool, indicated that the works "are of considerable magnitude, and the proprietors have particularly and pointedly adapted them to an extensive intercourse with America". The circular also tells us that the works had long been in the habit of making "Fire Engines, every description of machinery and all manner of castings".¹ This new venture, for which, Haliburton assured the Earl of Balcarres, "every exertion shall be made to ensure success", was, it is fair to note, begun on a note of cautious modesty. Haliburton's advice to His Lordship was surely exemplary: "Two conditions however, seem absolutely necessary—the assistance and guarantee of a substantial House or Houses in England, who are well acquainted with the Trade and stability of the merchants and proprietors of those Countries and a capital at the works here to warrant an increase of Trade and such extended credit as a Foreign Connexion generally requires". But despite this initial statement of sound business sense, in 1824 among the papers of the ironworks there is a list of bad debts amounting to £17,293 due from the sugar dealers of New Orleans, and £6,575 of Isle of France (Mauritius) debts. Finally, as to the consequences of Haliburton's managership, although there is little evidence to substantiate the charge, it does appear that he had financial interests in mines and a copperas works which he fostered at the expense of the Haigh works.

Thus it appears that again the Earl was unfortunate in his business associates. However, it must be recognized that there were deeper seated causes for the decline of the enterprise. The first and most important of these was the unsuitability of the Haigh coals.

Even in the early days of promise, under the keen supervision of Robert Lindsay, his experiments with the different

¹ Circular dated 1811.

kinds of coal and ironstone had revealed some of the disadvantages of the resources available locally. Even then modest results had only been achieved because they were "using much (iron) stone which had been picked up in the rivulets and long exposed to the air and had thrown off all the nasty stuff that adheres to the newly got". The output then per furnace was a mere 17 tons; and the average was nearer 14 tons per week. This prompted the Earl to compute that the concern would lose £1,000 a year at that rate, when iron was selling for £6 per ton.¹

In this connection, one cannot avoid observing, never was an enterprise so bedevilled by continual estimates of loss upon the working of the ironworks. The Earl of Balcarres devoted a great deal of energy to this aspect of the business. Indeed, there are at least twenty such estimates of losses impending. The worst of the matter is that it appears that the Earl was all too correct in his calculations in so far as the accounts will allow us to estimate the profitability of the firm. These, like the rest of the correspondence, are fragmentary, and no extensive analysis of the financial state of the firm is possible. The figures of profit and loss, indeed, relate only to the early period of the firm's history. A letter dated 29 January 1790² estimated a loss of £417 for the period of the blast and the writer goes on to say: "I am very clear that in making 14 Ton per week, supposing it all sold at £6 per ton we lost £1,000 a year". Perhaps this estimate was not sanguine enough of the ability of the furnaces to pay their way; at all events a few years later, between 1793 and 1795, a loss was sustained of £920 13s. 6d. over the three years.³ The next set of accounts is the most precise of all. Between 8 November 1806 and 31 March 1807 (when 435 tons of iron were made) on the working of No. 1 furnace there was a gross profit of £828 3s. 3d., but on No. 2 furnace there was a

¹ Estimate of 29 January 1790. Balcarres added: "I am convinced that our expenditure, before our outlays are at an end, in completing the one furnace and the Boring Mill and the Stock on hand, will be £15,000 to £16,000."

² It is essential to point out that although the figures given are of losses, the letters fail to make it clear over how long a time and therefore no strict comparisons of progress can be made.

³ Perhaps it is not remarkable that another ironmaster, Thomas Butler of Kirkstall Forge, near Leeds, during a visit to Haigh in 1797, also commented

loss of £517 16s. 5d. Of the balance some £245 had been spent upon a coal-pit, leaving a net profit of £65 or so.

In the period March-July 1808 the furnaces were even more promising in their prospects, a net profit of £221 10s. being registered. However, it appears that Balcarres was disappointed because he had expected a profit of £520 for the quarter, with a gain of £2 per ton of pig iron. Once more, this was an occasion for him to declare: "Should the answer to this (query) prove unsatisfactory, I have done with my blast iron concern". One furnace had been out of blast during this period, and Haliburton in reply could only propose continuing this policy. "I think, in the present state of the country and of the Funds of the works, it would not by any means be advisable to re-attune the blast."

This was a period of widespread slump in the industry, and, in fact, Balcarres not having carried out his threat, the works turned the tide, and the final figure is one of gross profit for the year ending March 1810. Sales amounted to £9,723 9s. 1½d. and the total expenditure in the works was £9,133 4s. If we forget about the change in the figure for stock, which Balcarres' queries to the manager reveal to have been in a chaotic state, there was thus a profit of £590 odd.

This rather unsatisfactory statement of the ironworks affairs goes, unfortunately, as far as the surviving accounts will allow; however, a word may be added about the period when the works were producing armaments for the Napoleonic wars. This stimulus was, as has been shown, not turned to good account as it was with so many other firms. The subsequent inquest, with family acrimony aroused because of attempts to impute responsibility, is of interest because the chief reasons for the relative failure of the concern were recognized and stated by the disputants. Once more Robert Lindsay was brought in. His upon the inefficiency of its management (28 February 1797). "After breakfast Harris Jnr. accompanied me to Lord Bellcarras [sic] Iron Works—about two miles from Wigan; they were most excellently situated and every material very convenient; but they are very improperly conducted. His Lordship knows nothing of the business and his agents almost as little. Many a thousand pound has been expended to no purpose. If these works were in the hands of people who could conduct them with propriety, they might make a fortune" (*Diary of Thomas Butler 1795-99*, edited by A. E., B. F. and H. M. Butler. Privately printed, 1906).

letter to Balcarres indicates the course of events. The control of the business had been left in the hands of a relative, but his hands had been tied because he only had responsibility in time of emergency. "The Ordnance concern was then going on briskly—but advances from Carstairs were up by £14,000." The average product, however, was very small; only $11\frac{1}{2}$ tons weekly. Contributing to the failure of the concern, some of the coal seams had been drowned out—the coal which was obtainable was "fit for nothing but country sale—it was therefore time to blow out . . .".¹ The works, nevertheless, were not blown out and in the blast department seem to have been fairly prosperous. A note records a profit of "2,000 and odd pounds" in 1793 and 1794. It was on the newly expanded part of the business to manufacture shot and shell (which entailed advances from Carstairs of up to £10,000—£8,082 7s. 1d. of which was spent on the buildings) where the business sustained its most serious loss. According to Carstairs,² about one-fifth of the total output of shell and shot had been rejected. A rough sort of Balance Sheet drawn up in 1796 gives some idea of the position of the works during this crisis.

BALANCE SHEET

Liabilities

£ s. d.

Debts due to works on Jan. 1793. (Less bad debts and debts due by works.)	2,612	9	7
Balance of Mr. Carstairs when shot and shell concern is real- ized	7,175	4	$4\frac{1}{2}$
(for buildings & improvements since 1793)			
Balance to Lord Balcarres for cannel & rent	825	0	0
Timber sold	2,228	0	0

 £12,840 13 11½
Assets

£ s. d.

Goods to London	1,400	0	0
2 Bills	650	0	0
Book debts	1,500	0	0
Goods in hand	5,000	0	0

 £8,550 0 0

Thus there was a deficiency of at least £4,290. It is small wonder that the works were reported by Lindsay in 1796 as

¹ Robert Lindsay—Earl of Balcarres, 13 August 1796.

² There is no precise indication in the manuscript as to who Carstairs was, but it seems likely that he was a London banker.

being at a stand and the shot and shell concern wound up. Yet Balcarres was assured that "you have as complete a set of works in Great Britain with every requisite to start afresh to advantage"; all that was required was a new engine costing £1,200 and "fresh capital must be produced of at least £3,000 for one furnace and double that sum for two".¹ The last part of Lindsay's advice was, by far, the most realistic when he gave his opinion: "that the proptr. of these works by residing on the spot and being up to the business in all its subordinate detail may make a livelyhood, but that it would never, I say never, answer conducted by a Manager".

Nevertheless, there was associated with the firm one engineer who must have brought some profit to the concern. This was Robert Daglish (1777-1865), who settled with a relative at Wigan in 1804² as engineer to the works. Perhaps under his management the engineering side of the business flourished. Certainly the elder Daglish³ showed considerable skill as a mechanic. It was at Haigh foundry that the first Lancashire locomotive was constructed, this being "The Walking Horse", made on the model of Blenkinsop's "Yorkshire Horse" which worked at the Middleton Colliery near Leeds.⁴ This was the beginning, it appears, of a successful venture in locomotive building, which continued until 1856, when the firm concentrated on the manufacture of mining machinery. Mention has been made earlier of the financial losses resulting from the export of sugar-mill machinery to Mauritius. However, technically the firm had mastered the production of steam engines and rolling mills, for in 1818 a sugar-mill unit consisting of "boiler, condensing engine and mill made by James Lindsay of Haigh Ironworks, Liverpool, was imported by Lt. Hannibal Price, R.N." into Haiti.⁵ In the following year there was drawn up

¹ Robert Lindsay—Earl of Balcarres, 13 Aug. 1796.

² I am indebted to Dr. T. C. Barker for this information.

³ His son, also Robert, left Wigan about 1830 for St. Helens, where he was prominent in industry and engineering. (See G. H. Tupling, *op. cit.* p. 28 and n.)

⁴ J. H. M. Banks, "Records of Mining in Winstanley & Orrell, near Wigan", *Trans. L. & C. Ant. Soc.* vol. liv, pp. 57-60.

⁵ *Trans. Newcomen Society*, vol. xxi. p. 16. A photograph of this plant, as it stood in 1930, was reproduced as an Appendix (Pl. VIII).

a price list of engines, ranging from £300 for a 4 h.p. to a 50 h.p. engine costing £1,870, delivered in Liverpool.

Although this history of the firm is sketchy, the documents throw some light on other aspects of industrial development, in particular the vital question of labour. Already we have seen how Robert Lindsay dealt with the problems of recruiting an efficient labour force. One factor which is sometimes overlooked—the competition of agriculture at this early stage in the Industrial Revolution as an alternative means of getting a living—is illustrated by the following remark of Robert Lindsay's: "the hay harvest having begun, many of our day labourers have left us." This was in June 1790, and perhaps this way of escape from industrialization did not remain open for very much longer. At any rate there was always the bottle. Drunkenness was a perennial source of complaint by the captains of industry, and the Haigh ironworks was no exception—"a set of the most drunken rascals I have ever met with", so Lindsay described his employees.

As to wages, the records are fragmentary. In 1808 the complement of the works included 13 Moulders (the highest wage of whom was 25s. a week), 9 Blacksmiths, 3 Boiler Makers, 8 Carpenters and Engineers. Earlier, in 1803, the list of work-people and their wages is fuller:

1803	<i>Wages per fortnight</i>	<i>No. 1 furnace</i>			<i>No. 2 furnace</i>		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Engine attendants		5	5	4	4	0	0
Wheeling ashes		1	15	0	1	15	0
Limestone breaker		1	16	0	1	16	0
Ironstone burner		1	12	0	1	12	0
Cokers		6	0	0	6	0	0
2 furnace fillers		3	10	0	3	10	0
2 keepers		5	0	0	5	0	0
1 stock taker (half-time)		0	15	0	0	0	0
1 labourer		1	10	0	1	10	0
Clerk in charge		1	10	0	0	0	0
Overlooker		2	2	0	0	0	0
		£30 15 4			£25 3 0		

It would be a unique firm which avoided labour troubles altogether, and Haigh was no exception. This time the evidence is for a much later period—1844, when much of the paternal relationship, if it ever existed, between master and man, had worn thin. Hence it is surprising to come across a petition signed by the Moulders of Haigh humbly “hoping you will not deem it a presumption by us in addressing you” and asking for a rise of 2s. a week. We do not know if this was granted.¹

The later history of the firm, as an engineering concern, may be briefly summarized here. The furnaces were finally blown out sometime before 1815, and were finally demolished in 1828.² Thus the Haigh ironworks developed as a foundry and engineering firm making such products as paddle shafts for steam boats, wrought iron work for churches and, of greatest importance, locomotives.³ It is said that the partnership which took over from the Earl in 1835 (consisting of Messrs. Evans, Ryley and Burrows) on a twenty-one years' lease, made 114 locomotives at Haigh in that period. When the lease expired in 1856 the decline from its period of greatest prosperity set in. The works, then in the hands of another partnership, Birley and Thompson, were concentrated upon the production of mining machinery, the locomotive business being given up.

¹ *Wigan Examiner*, 28 January and 4 February 1949. (An article by J. A. Melling, *The Engineering Industry in Wigan*).

² *Wigan Examiner*, 2 May 1856. Alexander, 6th Earl of Balcarres had died by this time (27 March 1825) and had been succeeded by his son James Lindsay (1783-1869). Haliburton left the partnership in 1829 (Haigh MSS.).

E. Baines, *History, Directory and Gazetteer of the County Palatine of Lancaster*, etc. (Liverpool, 1825), vol. ii, p. 611, states: “The late noble proprietor of Haigh rendered productive the iron and coal strata of his estate by commencing a foundry upon it in the year 1787, and after contending with many difficulties, he at length succeeded in establishing works for the construction of steam and other mechanical engines upon an extensive scale. . . . About 16 years ago the smelting of iron ore at these works was discontinued on account of the low price of metal, but from the recent advance in the price of iron, the intention is said to exist of re-erecting smelting furnaces at Haigh.” In the *Directory of Wigan* the name of the ironworks is given as: “Jas. Lindsay & Co.” (steam engines, millworks, etc.).

³ The famous Laxey Wheel, on the Isle of Man, was also built at Haigh (*Manchester Guardian*, 10 October 1946).

Here, there was more competition to be met, which Haigh could not face, and in 1884 the works were closed down.¹

¹ J. A. Melling, *op. cit.* This writer, who had intimate connections with Haigh, gives a divergent account of its origin and development. He suggests that the Earl of Balcarres' estate workshop outgrew its functions and that there was continual expansion from that time. The surviving manuscripts, however, do not substantiate this view, particularly for the early period of the firm's history.

GALILEE AND GALILEANS IN ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

By G. H. BOOBYER, B.A., B.D., D.THEOL.,

LECTURER IN DIVINITY, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM (NEWCASTLE DIVISION).

ST. MARK devotes more than half his gospel to a public ministry of Jesus centred upon Galilee, during which the teaching and mighty works of Jesus are said to find much response from the common people. At its conclusion the Master moves southward into Judaea and Jerusalem, only to be finally rejected there by the leaders of Judaism and crucified. But then the narrative points back to Galilee again. Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 indicate that the Lord and the disciples are to reassemble in Galilee immediately after the resurrection by the Lord's own appointment. These are clearly important features of St. Mark's record; and we are indebted particularly to Professors E. Lohmeyer and R. H. Lightfoot for calling special attention to them.¹

Professors Lohmeyer and Lightfoot have argued that doctrinal considerations lie behind the parts assigned to Galilee and Judaea in the Second Gospel. The evangelist, they suggest, regarded Galilee as the land divinely chosen for the revelation of salvation, whereas Judaea and Jerusalem were localities predestined to cast out the Christ, and then to be visited with judgement and doom. N. B. Stonehouse has instanced Marcan data which seem difficult to reconcile with this theory, such as the empty tomb in Jerusalem, or the events in the regions of Caesarea Philippi; ² but even so, Stonehouse concedes that the

¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936); *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1937). R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (1938); *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (1950). Much is also said about the Galilean character of the Second Gospel by Dr. P. Carrington in *The Primitive Christian Calendar*, vol. i (1952).

² N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (1944), especially pp. 40-9. Lohmeyer suggests that Mark's reference to revelation and mighty works in Tyre and Sidon, Caesarea Philippi and the Decapolis means that he thought in terms of a "christliche Galiläa" which included these regions (*Galiläa u. Jerusalem*, p. 27).

extent of Mark's interest in Galilee as an area where the gospel is proclaimed and the powers of the kingdom of God are disclosed is a real problem, inviting further examination.

The question is not without relation to the treatment of Galilee in St. Matthew's Gospel, for there again Galilee has its importance. A picture of the risen Christ meeting the eleven disciples on a Galilean mountain, where he commissions them to go forth to a world-wide mission amongst the Gentiles closes the gospel. Its beginning also suggests the importance of Galilee; and, somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, it appears to associate the commencement of Christ's ministry in Galilee with the proclamation of the gospel to Gentiles, since Matt. iv. 15 f. treats the movement of Jesus from Nazareth to Capernaum as a fulfilment of Isa. ix. 1 f. The Lord's action brings light in place of darkness to "Galilee of the Gentiles". How literally did the First Evangelist intend this reference to Gentiles in applying Isa. ix. 1 f. to the Galilean ministry of Jesus? And how far was his connection of Galilee with Gentiles carried in the thought of the apostolic church? Did St. Mark share it? If so, was he too writing under the influence of the Old Testament?

1. There are Old Testament passages, more especially in the LXX, which seem to shed light upon the conception of Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark.

(a) In several places the LXX speaks of Galilee as inhabited by Gentiles, or uses the designation "Galilee of the Gentiles". Like the Massoretic text, the LXX at Judges i. 30 and 33 mentions that the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali did not drive the Canaanites from amongst them. Joel iv. 4 indicts Galilee as a Gentile land which conspired with other Gentile lands against Judah. 1 Macc. v. 21 reports that Simon Maccabaeus did battle in Galilee with Gentiles who lived there. Finally, the land is explicitly named "Galilee of the Gentiles" three times: in Isa. viii. 23 *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν*; and in Joel iv. 4 and 1 Macc. v. 15 *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἀλλοφύλων*. Perhaps the rendering of LXX Joshua xii. 23 should also be noted. It seems that גליל in the Hebrew text has been taken by the Greek translator as a proper name, whereas the M.T. text apparently intended a

reference to "Galilee of the Gentiles". In the Old Testament, then, and especially in the LXX version, there is a repeated association of Galilee with the Gentiles. Gentiles are said to have lived there; and some prominence is given to the name "Galilee of the Gentiles".

(b) But there are two LXX passages which may have peculiar importance for our problem. They are Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6 and Ezek. xlvii. 1-12; and they depict Galilee of the Gentiles as specially appointed to receive salvation in the messianic age, and, further, as a land which will be one of the first to experience God's deliverance.¹

The writer of Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6 proclaims that the light of the messianic day will disperse the shadow of death lying over "Galilee of the Gentiles"; and the LXX text of ch. viii. 23 begins with a notable addition to the M.T. version—an addition which apparently means that God will pour forth this light of His salvation first upon Galilee: τοῦτο πρῶτον πίε (or ποίει)². ταχὺ ποίει . . . Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν.

Again, according to Ezek. xlvii. 1-12, the prophet beholds a river issuing from under the threshold of the house of the Lord in Jerusalem. It is a river of life with trees of healing upon its bank, and it gives life whithersoever it courses. Fishers standing upon its banks are to catch a great multitude of fish (verse 10)—and it was flowing towards Galilee (verse 8)!

The Christian seer of Patmos had pondered over this picture; though he spoke of a river whose source was in the New Jerusalem. He also added another feature to the river's significance: with its tree of life it was εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν (Rev. xxii. 2). Had the writer of the Second Gospel also reflected upon Ezekiel's Galilean coursing river, and made his connections between it and the Gentiles? Had he, further, linked it up with Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6, and in this way come to the conclusion that Galilee

¹ H. W. Montefiore in "The Position of the Cana Miracle and the Cleansing of the Temple in St. John's Gospel", *J.T.S.*, I. (1949), 183-6, uses both these passages in an explanation of the Fourth Evangelist's early placing of the miracle of the wine and the cleansing of the temple.

² Swete's edition of the LXX text prefers the lection πίε instead of the first ποίει, whilst A. Rahlfs' choice is ποίει in both places. Rahlfs also includes the reading τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας after Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν.

was chosen to be the scene of the beginning of these saving activities of God amongst the Gentiles? Mark i. 17 with its call to Simon and Andrew in Galilee to become fishers of men certainly reminds us of Ezek. xlvii. 10; and when Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 bid the disciples return to Galilee after the resurrection might it not be for a fuller discharge of missionary obligations on lines suggested by Ezek. xlvii. 1-12 taken together with Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6? In other words, is the prominence given to Galilee in St. Mark's Gospel in some measure due—as apparently in St. Matthew—to an association of Galilee with the Gentile mission? And do Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 really mean that in Mark's mind the commencement of the post-Easter work of the church was to be in Galilee and was to consist principally in the ingathering of the Gentiles?

2. The ethnic situation in Galilee in the first century would have permitted Mark to think in such terms.

Galilee had a mixed population in Mark's day. Towns like Tiberias and Sepphoris were mostly Gentile communities with a pagan way of life. Greeks and hellenized Syrians were scattered over the land. Romans were also to be seen. G. Schrenk remarks that the audiences of Jesus in Jewish localities will have contained Gentiles, and even in the synagogues;¹ whilst E. W. G. Masterman ventures to say that only in more secluded places like Nazareth were Jewish ideals preserved with any considerable degree of perfection.²

But were the writer and the first readers of the Second Gospel aware of these Galilean, racial conditions? Knowledge of them was certainly not limited to Palestine, for we find a writer like Strabo speaking of "mixed stocks of people from Aegyptian and Arabian and Phoenician tribes" occupying Galilee.³ And would not Diaspora Jewry have had knowledge of the Galilean situation? Diaspora Jews were in touch with the homeland. Moreover, in their efforts to keep the Law in their pagan environment, similar problems arose to those which confronted Jews in Galilee by the racial mixture in that area.

¹ *Galiläa zur Zeit Jesu* (1941), p. 17.

² *Studies in Galilee* (1909), pp. 129-41.

³ "The Geography of Strabo", XVI, 2,³⁴ (*Loeb Classical Library*, vii. 281).

This would increase their interest in Galilean affairs and in the attitude of Judæan Jewry to Galilean, Jewish life. But many of these Jews of the Dispersion became members of the Christian church, and would then become sources of information about Galilee in the new Christian communities. There is also the tradition that Mark was the author of the Second Gospel. If this is reliable, and if it refers to John Mark of Jerusalem, as is commonly believed, then the writer of the Second Gospel, as a Jerusalem Jew, was, presumably, fully conversant with the extent to which Galilee in his time was inhabited by non-Jewish peoples. But as a matter of fact the gospels themselves do show some awareness of the presence of Gentiles in Galilee, not forgetting Matthew's reference, already mentioned, to "Galilee of the Gentiles".

Both the LXX, then, and the ethnic facts of the Galilean situation could have induced the Second Evangelist to connect Galilee with Gentiles; and he could therefore have looked upon it as a natural starting place for the Gentile mission. If so, the Master's express wish, mentioned in xiv. 28 and xvi. 7, that the disciples should go to Galilee after the resurrection may well have implied for Mark an exhortation to go there chiefly for the purpose of commencing the Gentile mission.

3. Are these suggestions supported by a study of Mark's text? The first question to ask is:

(a) What was likely to happen in Galilee after the crucifixion, according to Mark's view of the subsequent course of Christian history?

E. Lohmeyer held that when the evangelist inserted Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 into his gospel, he understood them to mean, primarily, that in Galilee the disciples were soon to witness the parousia—the final consummation of the redemptive work of Christ, not resurrection scenes before that final triumph.¹

Much more frequently, Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 have been thought to point forward to resurrection appearances of Jesus in Galilee. There the disciples would meet the risen Lord

¹ *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, pp. 10-14; *Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 312 and 356. Cf. also R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, pp. 61 ff. and 73-7.

again, before his ascension; and from this conclusion the further inference has been drawn that the author of the gospel originally continued beyond xvi. 8 with a record of Galilean, resurrection episodes.

But Professor Lightfoot's more recent treatment of Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 suggest that there is another possibility with which to reckon. The disciples, he writes, were to go to Galilee, because there they "have a work awaiting them . . . the reader's thought is turned back to the story of the ministry in the early chapters of the book, and he perceives that this is also the ministry to be fulfilled henceforth by the Lord . . . and through his disciples who now represent him in the world".¹

These words allow more fully for an important expectation which has a firm place in what St. Mark relates about the fulfilment of the eschatological process after the crucifixion. This expectation has been much neglected in attempts to interpret Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7. The Second Gospel does, of course, point forward to the resurrection and the parousia of the Son of Man. Passages like viii. 31, 38; ix. 9, 31; x. 34, 37; xiii. and xiv. 62 explicitly attest it. But the gospel is also concerned to say that another event must take place before the final consummation. The resurrection is to be followed by a world-wide proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles. Volkmar, indeed, held this to be the main interest of the evangelist, who, he argued, was writing in defence of St. Paul's thought and work.² But although much of Volkmar's exposition may be mistaken, partly because of the extreme lengths to which he carried the symbolical interpretation of St. Mark, it is none the less true that the post-Easter mission to the Gentiles does find prominent mention in Mark's work. Scholars naturally vary in their assessment of the extent to which the author of the Second Gospel was occupied with this theme, and we shall return to this point. Suffice it here to say that the importance of the conversion of the Gentiles for Mark is recognized. Apart

¹ *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 116. Cf. also P. Carrington, *op. cit.* p. 88.

² G. Volkmar, *Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien nach dem urkundlichen Text* (Zürich, 1876).

from possible allusions to it in passages like i. 17; iv. 32; x. 45; xi. 17; xiv. 24 and others, its presence is definite in xii. 9; xiii. 10, 27 and xiv. 9.

Is it not then evident that this feature of Mark's narrative must have a considerable bearing upon the exegesis of Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7? A place must be found for the commencement of the evangelization of the Gentiles in Mark's conception of the course of affairs after the cross. Since, therefore, he depicts the disciples as under a dominical injunction to return to Galilee after the resurrection, is it not likely that he thought that there they were not only to see the risen Lord, but were also under his guidance to begin the evangelization of the Gentiles?

(b) St. Mark's attitude to the Jews is another relevant point. He is at pains to show the rejection of Jesus by the leadership of Judaism, and that means by the Jewish nation.

From ch. ii. onwards the evangelist begins to reveal the main source of the opposition to Jesus Christ. Already, in the Galilean period, it springs principally from the scribes and Pharisees, though the Herodians, too, take a hand in it, and Herod himself is shown to be apprehensive about Jesus and to be in opposition to the Lord's cause in that he has slain John the Baptist whose life and witness were, for Mark, part of "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" (i. 1-8). The information in iii. 22 and vii. 1, that some of the scribes concerned in this hostility to Jesus had come down from Jerusalem, serves to underline the point that even in the Galilean period the attack upon Jesus had support from the Jerusalem authorities. As the narrative moves towards its conclusion, the Jerusalem leaders come more prominently to the fore as the main opponents. Precise mention is made of the Sadducees; the chief priests; the Sanhedrin; Judas, after he had made common cause with the high priests and the Sanhedrin (xiv. 10, 11, 43); a Jerusalem multitude acting under instructions from the Sanhedrin (xiv. 43); and a multitude stirred up by the chief priests (xv. 11). This woeful story of criticism, obstruction and enmity from those whom the evangelist regards as the religious and political heads of Israel reaches its terrible climax at Calvary; and in this action the leaders of Judaism are regarded as the

real judges and executioners who condemn and crucify their king.¹

Upon such outright Jewish rejection of Jesus there must fall the divine judgement; and Mark makes that clear, too. The judgement is also as final as the rejection. We see it in passages like that of the withering of the fig tree (especially xi. 14), the prediction of the disinheritance and destruction of the wicked husbandmen (xii. 9); the forecast of the overthrow of the temple (xiii. 2) and the rent veil (xv. 38). As M. Werner has pointed out, there is not even a Pauline theory of the temporary hardening of Israel to soften the severer lines of the tragedy.² But if the Jewish nation has so completely as a nation cast out the Son, and has itself in turn been cast out, what remains for the Lord's disciples but to concentrate upon the winning of the Gentiles? Not, of course, in the sense that no Jews would now hear the gospel and be saved; but in the sense that the old Israel as such, officially represented in its leadership, had been disowned, and was to cease to be the main objective of the saving work of Jesus Christ. Therefore the field now to be harvested was principally the Gentile world. Is this not another reason for supposing that when the disciples are told to leave the Judæan scene of the Jewish rejection of Jesus to meet the resurrected Lord again in Galilee, it is, as St. Mark sees it, largely because in Galilee they are to enter the new Gentile field in which it now remains to put forth the sickle?

(c) In St. Mark's Gospel the passion seems to be viewed as an occasion on which Jesus is handed over by Judaism to the Gentile world. That is to say, the cross is not only the climax of Israel's repudiation of the Christ, its king, but also the moment at which in delivering him up to the Gentiles for

¹ Cf. Mark iii. 6; xi. 18; xii. 7, 8, 12; as well as xiv. 1 and the part played by the Jewish authorities in the rest of the passion narrative. Mark, of course, represents a view current in the early church, e.g. Acts iii. 13-17; v. 30; x. 39 and I Thess. ii. 15.

² *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (1923), pp. 184-96. Werner thinks, however, that although Mark emphasizes the rejection of Jesus by the heads of Judaism he regarded many Jews as predestined for salvation along with Gentiles.

crucifixion the Jews are in fact transferring him from the unbelieving enmity of their own group to the responsive faith of the other. The passion is a transition point at which Jesus ceases to be king of the Jews, and begins to be Lord of the Gentiles.¹

This conception of the cross is suggested in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and its appended O.T. quotation (xii. 1-12). The story implies that the Jewish people, represented in their leaders, slay the messianic Son, and cast him out of the vineyard. But as a result not only is the vineyard to go to "others", but also the Son; and amongst those "others" this stone, rejected by the builders, is received to become head of the corner. Verse eleven makes it apparent who the evangelist considered these "others" to be. "It is marvellous in our eyes" will surely have meant for him that it was marvellous in the eyes of the members of the Gentile Christian church for whom Mark compiled his gospel.

This attitude to the passion is even more explicit perhaps in the report concerning the Roman centurion at the foot of the cross. He was one of those Gentiles to whom "the chief priests and the scribes" had delivered Jesus to be mocked, scourged and crucified (x. 33 f.). But in the centurion's case this step had further consequences immediately. As Mark looked upon it, apparently, the centurion, by receiving Jesus to crucify him came also to behold and confess him as Son of God, and thus exemplifies the beginning of that believing acceptance of Jesus which was forthwith to follow in the wider, Gentile world.

Is it not also along similar lines that important passages like viii. 31; ix. 31; x. 33 f. and xiv. 41 receive their full meaning? They speak plainly of the cross as the rejection of the Son of Man by the Jews—especially viii. 31 and x. 33 f.—and also add that *παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων* (ix. 31), that *παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* (x. 33), and that *παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν* (xiv. 41). No doubt the betrayal by Judas to the Jewish authorities and

¹ Cf. M. Kiddle, "The Death of Jesus and the Admission of the Gentiles in St. Mark", *J.T.S.*, vol. xxxv (1934), 45 ff.

the Sanhedrin's handing over of the Son of Man to Pilate and the Roman soldiery were included in the evangelist's understanding of these passages. The actions of the Roman soldiers are clearly in mind in x. 33. But is it not also certain that these verses mean more? What, for instance, asks J. Schniewind, does "deliver up" really mean?¹ Many scholars suggest that the words of ix. 31, at least, contain wider soteriological teaching like that in Rom. viii. 32.

It is surely significant that St. Mark reports Jesus as using such broad terms as "men", "Gentiles" and "sinners" for those to whom he will be handed over, when elsewhere the narrative is so much more specific, and refers directly to the Pharisees, Herodians, chief priests, elders, scribes, the Sanhedrin, or to Pilate, the soldiers and the centurion as those immediately implicated in the Son of Man's destruction. Indeed, throughout the Second Gospel there is no hesitation in naming Christ's enemies precisely. Again, it is of importance to ask what possible meanings *ἄνθρωποι* and *ἁμαρτωλοί* could have had for Mark. They appear in Mark i. 17 and ii. 17, to describe the total scope of the mission of Jesus, to indicate those whom the Lord came to save. In these two passages *ἄνθρωποι* and *ἁμαρτωλοί* would naturally include believing Jews; but is it not just as certain that the writer of the gospel, who stresses Jewish unbelief, will have understood them in the light of the missionary situation of the church in his day, and have seen in them a reference chiefly to Gentiles? Philologically, too, this would have been quite possible. *ἄνθρωποι* was a common enough expression for "men in general"; and *ἁμαρτωλοί* had come to be used in the sense of *ἔθνη* in the vocabulary of the LXX, in Greek speaking Judaism and in the early church.²

Does not real justification then exist for saying that the full sense in which the Second Evangelist interprets "men" in ix. 31 and "sinners" in xiv. 41 includes the meaning "Gentiles"? Especially as the use of "Gentiles" at x. 33 could be only a more

¹ In commenting upon Mark. ix. 31 f. in "Das Evangelium nach Markus", (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch* series) (1949), p. 126.

² See, for example, Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, I, especially pp. 328-32.

precise expression of what is contained in the other two, parallel verses. In sum, in all these three passages, the evangelist's account of the words of Jesus appears to carry a reference to the Gentiles in the world at large whom the Son of Man has come to save, and with viii. 31 they represent the passion as a moment at which Jesus is surrendered not only to the Jewish authorities, or to Pilate and his soldiers to be crucified, but also to the wider Gentile world to become its Lord. If so, then *παραδιδόναι* in ix. 31 ; x. 33 and xiv. 41 has a double meaning : it implies the betrayal of Jesus to his Jewish foes and his Roman executioners, but also, thereby, his deliverance to the Gentiles in the more general sense to become their Saviour.¹ It is not surprising, then, that in Mark's view of the cross the Gentiles who actually put Jesus to death were not his real enemies at all. The evangelist does not, of course, represent them as having had any premeditated will to destroy him. They are simply depicted as tools of the Jewish authorities, and the agents through whom the predestined suffering and death of the Son of Man are realized. But in playing this rôle they do but perform the tragic necessities of their own salvation. They liberate the Lord from the limitations of his life in the flesh amongst his Jewish compatriots, and free him to enter forthwith upon his resurrection life of universal sovereignty amongst the Gentiles. The cross, therefore, with the subsequent resurrection is the passing of Jesus from the one sphere to the other.

But what does this imply, again, for the Second Evangelist's conception of the events which are to follow upon the crucifixion ? What does it bring to the interpretation of the Lord's expressed desire to be reunited with the disciples in Galilee, as stated in Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 ? Is it not, once more, that the reunion in Galilee is for the purpose of setting forward the new dominion of Christ amongst the Gentiles ?

¹ What happens to St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles provides an interesting parallel to all this. In Acts xxi. 11, Agabus prophesies that in Jerusalem the Jews will bind Paul and *παράδωσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἔθνων*. At Acts xxviii. 17 this becomes *δέσμιος ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων παρεδόθην εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων*. But the ultimate outcome of it all was that with the final, Jewish repudiation of Paul made plain (Acts xxviii. 23-7), the Jews have brought it about that Paul and "this salvation of God" go to the Gentile community.

(d) Galilee is already associated with the evangelization of the Gentiles in St. Mark's account of the Galilean period of Christ's public ministry. Mark i. to ix., in fact, presents Jesus at that stage of his work as already breaking with Judaism and turning to the Gentiles.

The interest in the Gentiles in the first half of the gospel has been noticed by many scholars, especially its presence in vi.-viii. Johannes Weiss, for example, thought that in the Galilean period the writer of the gospel endeavoured to present Jesus as the founder or forerunner of the Gentile mission.¹ Recently, Austin Farrer has interpreted Mark vii. 1-ix. 1 as occupied chiefly with the theme of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.²

Naturally opinions vary about the extent to which the Gentiles occupy the evangelist's thought in his account of the Galilean ministry. Much depends upon how one understands the structure of the gospel as a whole and the interpretation to be given to numerous details. But it seems possible to maintain that two leading themes are consciously in Mark's mind in these early chapters. From ii. onwards we are deliberately shown that Judaism is rising up against Jesus Christ; and this Jewish hostility, as K. L. Schmidt held,³ reaches something of a climax in the Galilean period with the rejection of Jesus in the *πατρίς* as described in vi. 1-6. The suspicion and previous actions of Herod in ch. vi. 14-29 also illustrate the same topic. Alongside this growing Jewish unbelief there emerges an interest of Jesus in the Gentiles; and it becomes more pronounced after Christ's rejection by his fellow-townsmen in the *πατρίς* and the references to Herod. There are probably allusions to this subject as early as i. 17 and ii. 17, as already suggested; and possibly again in iv. 32. It has more explicit reference in v. 1-20 (especially verses 19 and 20); but it becomes an outstanding theme in vi. 30 to viii. 26. vii. 1-23 deals with defilement by food, and endorses to a surprising extent an attitude acceptable to Gentile Christians, especially in the

¹ *Das älteste Evangelium* (1903), pp. 82 ff.

² *A Study in St. Mark* (1951), especially chs. vi. and xiii.

³ *Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919), pp. 152-71.

apparent repudiation of all the Levitical food taboos (vii. 18 f.). vii. 24-30 shows the Master sharing the children's bread with a Gentile woman ; vii. 31-7, viii. 22-6 and ix. 14-29 depict him opening the eyes, ears and lips of (apparently) Gentiles ; and the remainder of vi. 30 to viii. 26 is chiefly concerned with the miracles of the loaves and the comment upon them in viii. 14-21. The feeding of the four thousand has frequently been held to symbolize the spiritual feeding of the Gentiles ; and a case can be made out for the view that the feeding of the five thousand had the same prefigurative sense. It points to the later Gentile mission. I have tried to show this in an article published elsewhere.¹ It is also of consequence that from v. of ix. Jesus repeatedly uses Galilee as a centre from which to make incursions into Gentile territory. He visits the Decapolis, Tyre and Sidon, Bethsaida and the villages of Caesarea Philippi ; and earlier, in Mark iii. 8, the multitude around him even in Galilee is said to have been made up partly of people who came to him from some of these Gentile territories.

For Christians in Mark's Gentile Christian circle, laid probably under the necessity of defending their claim to be the true Israel against Jewish attack, these features of the Galilean ministry of Jesus must have had the greatest significance. In them, as they saw it, the Master's intention was plain. He had concerned himself with Gentiles. In Galilee, he had met them, and had spoken words which justified Gentile-Christian practices. From Galilee, he had gone to them, even into neighbouring territories, and there had healed them and fed them ; and possibly the feeding of the two multitudes was looked upon as a particularly important revelation of what was ordained to come to pass—though not even the Twelve then understood these miracles (viii. 14-21).

If therefore it was above all in Galilee that Jesus had made his first approaches to the Gentiles ; if there he had had response from Gentiles ; and if there he had spoken and acted in ways which foreshadowed the fuller proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles, would it not be natural that, when rejected by the

¹ "The Miracles of the Loaves and the Gentiles", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. vi, no. 1, March 1953.

Jews, he should return to Galilee to resume and fulfil this work ? Is it even possible that the author of the Second Gospel sees that suggested in Mark iii. 31-5 ? It may not be unimportant that this pericope immediately precedes the parables of the Kingdom in iv., in which the extent and nature of the harvest of the Kingdom of God is set forth. But who will be gathered, and have their place in the Kingdom ? In Mark iii. 31-5, the Lord is addressing a multitude in Galilee. He asks, "Who is my mother and my brethren ?" "Mother" and "brethren" were terms current in the later fellowship of the Christian church to describe the unity in Christ of Christian believers.¹ For that reason, the passage will have been readily associated in the minds of the evangelist and his readers with the church as they knew it—the Gentile Christian church. But where and from amongst whom was this eschatological community of the elect to be gathered ? Mark iii. 31-5 certainly links some of that ingathering with Galilee. "*And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren !*" (verse 34).

It is of consequence to mention here a conclusion of Dr. P. Carrington's about the use of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand in the apostolic church. Dr. Carrington, holding the Second Gospel to have been compiled as a lectionary for church worship, believes it possible, largely on the basis of manuscript evidence, to assign Mark's sections to the places they had in the calendar of the liturgical year of the primitive church. He maintains that the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand was an Easter Sunday reading.² I have already referred to an article of mine (written before Dr. Carrington's book was published) in which it has been maintained that this miraculous feeding prefigured the evangelization of the Gentiles. If these two conclusions are put together, the result is obviously most relevant to the theory set out in the present essay. Here it is being suggested that Mark's considerable interest in Galilee

¹ "Brother" and "sister" were commonly used. For "mother", see Rom. xvi. 13. Other passages indicate the family character of early Christian fellowship, e.g. Rom. xvi. 16 ; Gal. vi. 10 ; Eph. ii. 19 ; Acts. ii. 44 and iv. 32.

² *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (1952), especially pp. 75-89.

arises in no small degree from his association of Galilee with the commencement of the Gentile mission ; and that Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 mean that the disciples are to return to Galilee, because there they are to carry forward this activity. Then what more fitting lection could be chosen for Easter Sunday than a passage in which the Lord had signified that as the disciples had distributed natural bread to a hungry multitude so they were to take the bread of life which he provided and carry it to the Gentile world ?

With this point we end the review of the internal evidence of St. Mark's text. Does it not of itself suggest that the evangelist is so interested in Galilee because he looks upon it as the land from which the disciples were to initiate that mission which would result chiefly in the conversion of the Gentiles ? But this evidence, we have intimated, should perhaps be read against the background of the LXX and the facts of the racial situation in Galilee in the evangelist's lifetime. From both these sources, the writer of the gospel had every encouragement to think of Galilee as " Galilee of the Gentiles " and, therefore, as the area of Christian outreach mainly to the Gentiles. He believed that messianic salvation had gone forth from Jerusalem—from the cross and the empty tomb. But Ezekiel's Galilean flowing river and Isaiah's light of the messianic deliverance in " Galilee of the Gentiles " could have helped to persuade him that the Lord had intended that the first missionary objective was to be neither Jerusalem nor Judaea but Galilee of the Gentiles, where the disciples had been first called to be fishers of men. There they were now to take a *πλήθος πολὺ σφόδρα*, like the fishers of Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. xlvii. 10). The dominical mandate, therefore, to return to Galilee after the resurrection, as mentioned in Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7, was in the nature of a charge to them to enter fully upon their divinely appointed, missionary responsibilities ; it was tantamount, as Mark saw it, to an announcement that now, even though believing Jews could still be saved, the hour had struck for the world-wide offering of salvation to the Gentiles—an eschatological, redemptive mission by means of which " the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner ".

BROWNING: THE MAKING OF THE DRAMATIC LYRIC¹

By H. B. CHARLTON, C.B.E., M.A., D. DE D., LITT.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

IN 1842 Browning published a collection of sixteen short poems under the title of *Dramatic Lyrics*; in 1845 he produced a volume of twenty-one similarly conceived pieces; the title he gave to this second collection was *Dramatic Romances and Lyrics*. In 1855 he issued two volumes called *Men and Women*, in which there were fifty and one poems cast in the now established pattern. In 1864 a further group of similarly moulded poems appeared under the title *Dramatis Personae*. There is general agreement that between them these five volumes (with *The Ring and the Book* added to them) contain the most characteristic and the best of Browning's poetic art. They are most characteristic and best because in them Browning found the poetic form which most completely expressed his own apprehension of the nature of things human and divine. It was a poetic form which would permit a multitude of variations within itself; but all the modifications would fall functionally within the generic pattern. For the purpose of this lecture, Dramatic Lyric is taken as the most suitable generic label for the poems collected in the volumes recounted above.

Essentially the Dramatic Lyric is a poem spoken by a person who is not the poet, but who is a person imagined by the poet and presented by him in a particular set of circumstances. As the speaker speaks his poem, his utterances express the effects of the impact on him of the given environment, situation, or circumstance. Take, for instance, "Through the Metidja to Abd-el-Kadr", which appeared in the first of these collections, *Dramatic Lyrics* (1842). The title of the poem would have inspired much more imaginative readiness in its reader in 1842

¹ The substance of two lectures delivered in the John Rylands Library on the 10th of October 1951 and the 8th of October 1952.

than it is likely to give to today's reader. In 1842 the Algerian chieftain, Abd-el-Kadr, was heavily defeated by the French army of occupation, and the tale of his exploits of resistance on the great plain of Algeria, the Metidja, was eagerly read in English newspapers. Hence, the title would provide the 1842 reader with theatre-programme and stage-directions sufficient to start his (the reader's) production of the poem on the stage of his own imagination. He could have hazarded a safe guess that the speaker was a tribesman of Abd-el-Kadr's on his way across the desert to join his chieftain in battle against the invader. This "hazarding a guess" is part of Browning's technique for the dramatic lyric. It is an imaginative prodding or prompting to arouse an expectancy, normally directly fulfilled, of the appropriate setting for the episode it preludes—just as "Through the Metidja" suggests the scenario of a desert journey. Sometimes the prompting is more dramatic, because it arouses an expectation exactly the opposite of what will immediately be forthcoming: for instance, the title, "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister", arouses expectancy of a holy recluse's intense communion with God; but in fact its first words are:

Gr-r-r—there go, my heart's abhorrence!
Water your damned flower-pots, do!

If not by its title, however, a dramatic lyric must quickly give the reader clues from which he can improvise notions about the sort of person who is speaking, and the circumstances within which he is speaking, so that as reader, he can visualize the scene, watch its movements and enter into the moods and feelings induced in the speaker by his situation. Hence, reading a dramatic lyric, one starts by seeking answers to three primary questions: who is speaking, what sort of a person is he (or she), and in what circumstances is he speaking?

Let us watch how "Through the Metidja to Abd-el-Kadr" produces itself in the theatre of the reader's mind. From the first stanza it is clear that, through rhyme and rhythm, sound (that is, noise) is being used as a major dramatizing medium. Recurrent hoof-beats are being reproduced rapidly to "imitate" (in the Greek sense) the rhythmic waves of the horse's superb movement. One hears, too, the repetitive frequency of a

decisive rhyming unit, recurring thirteen times in the stanza, and then repeated thirteen times in each of the four following stanzas, making in all sixty-five clangings of the noise “-IDE” (as in “ride”) in a total of forty lines. A physical, ear-drum, rhythm is being used to prompt an emotional rhythm. The rider in his riding is becoming one with his horse and his feelings are rising towards a fanatic ecstasy. In the meantime, the reader, too, is to feel that the measurable physical beats stir in him a psychological response corresponding to the receptivity secured when a wireless set is tuned in to the wave-length of a transmitter. At least that appears to be the prosodic purpose. It may well be that the technique is clumsily employed in this poem. Its noises may numb the reader, may compel him not into the rising mood of exaltation which its speaker attains, but into an unresponsive torpor of indifference. Moreover, in the attempt to give these noises their chance to fulfil their purpose, more than once the poet has to do violence to those attributes other than noise which are no less, and indeed may be much more, significant constituents of the poet’s noise-instruments, that is, of vocables in the form of words.

As I ride, as I ride
With a full heart for my guide,
So its tide rocks my side . . .

“Guide”, “tide”, “side” are, of course, necessary to the rhyming : but a “full heart” is not the safest instrument by which to steer a bicycle or a motor car ; indeed, it could so easily lead to a prosecution for dangerous driving. Moreover, the heart-throbs of a full heart do, of course, produce a recurrent pulse, and so the blood-stream may be thought of as a “tide”. Perhaps, too, since the heart is somewhat to the left side of the body, the rider may feel its throbs more strongly on his left side, although the real tidal flow pervades both corporeal hemispheres. In any case, as in a good deal of modern poetry, the noise of a word is frequently a much more obvious reason for its choice than is either its rational or its imaginative significance :

So its tide rocks my side,
As I ride, as I ride,
That, as I were double-eyed,
He, in whom our Tribes confide . . .

"Double-eyed": but surely the rider was not cyclopean: he was a normal two-eyed human, and was, in fact, "double-eyed" in the natural way. But Browning secures his rhyme by a distorted substitute for "second-sighted":

He, in whom our Tribes confide,
Is described, ways untried
As I ride, as I ride. . . .

"Untried"; hence, of course, the need for such an unlicensed driver for guide, "a full heart".

But to read the stanza in the way we have just suggested is obviously to be hypercritical. It was meant to be so, in order to illustrate some of the many difficulties which Browning would encounter, and in due course would overcome, in shaping the Dramatic Lyric. In this first stanza, for instance, he is grappling with the primary problem in dramatizing a lyric. He is not only seeking to give lyrical expression to the sensations, feelings, and emotions of the person who is speaking: he is attempting at the same time to reproduce the dynamism of those feelings, that is, to reveal in imaginative action the particular forces which are bringing those feelings into being. To start the activating of the necessary forces in this first stanza, Browning has over-strained his mechanism. But once the horse and its rider get into their stride, the poem begins to sweep on by its own momentum, no longer needing too violent distortions of sense by sound.

As I ride, as I ride
To our Chief and his Allied,
Who dares chide my heart's pride
As I ride, as I ride? . . .

The rider's excitement grows with the exhilaration of his riding: his fervour is unchecked and uncheckable. "Who dares chide" is, of course, a rhetorical question: the rider is alone in an empty desert. But the question itself enhances the exaltation:

Or are witnesses denied—
Through the desert waste and wide
Do I glide unespied
As I ride, as I ride? . . .

The plain (and hypercritical) answer to the question is that the rider is riding unespied; but poetically and dramatically the

phrase fulfils its purpose in significant sense. The riding passes into a gliding : the pure rhythm of motion has seized the rider.

As I ride, as I ride,
When an inner voice has cried . . .

His tribal instincts surge through his veins, and as he rides in perfect rhythm, it is as if he himself is motionless whilst beneath him the sands slide away like the drifting of lava or the sliding of an avalanche.

When an inner voice has cried,
The sands slide, nor abide
(As I ride, as I ride)
O'er each visioned homicide
That came vaunting (has he lied ?)
To reside—where he died,
As I ride, as I ride . . .

As the upper layer of sand appears to slip from the earth's surface, the rider excitedly imagines that he sees uncovered the bones of former invaders who had boasted that they came to occupy the land, as indeed they did—but as corpses, not as conquerors ! Perhaps “ visioned ” homicide is a verbal strain, if, as I imagine, it merely means the homicide whose corpse now seems visible to the mind's eye. But

vaunting (has he lied ?)
To reside—where he died,

restores the imaginative grip which the poem is now holding secure.

It seems as if the rider's ecstasy could scarcely attain more complete possession. But the riding is not yet done, and to increase the impetus which will carry the rider to transcendent attainment, the next stanza returns to the primary physical sensations of the riding :

As I ride, as I ride,
Ne'er has spur my swift horse plied,
Yet his hide, streaked and pied,
As I ride, as I ride,
Shows where sweat has sprung and dried,
—Zebra-footed, ostrich-thighed—
How has vied stride with stride
As I ride, as I ride !

So, caught into the rapturous feeling of his oneness with his horse, with circumstance, with the moment, and with himself,

the rider reaches the intoxication of spiritual satisfaction, an absolute fulfilment in the experience of the moment, "the moment made eternity", as the phrase has it in another riding poem, "The Last Ride Together".

As I ride, as I ride,
 Could I loose what Fate has tied,
 Ere I pried, she should hide
 (As I ride, as I ride)
 All that's meant me—satisfied
 When the Prophet and the Bride
 Stop veins I'd have subside
 As I ride, as I ride!

Such is "Through the Metidja to Abd-el-Kadr". Such is the dramatic lyric in Browning's earlier experiments with it as a poetic form which was to prove itself particularly suited to his artistic needs. Before looking at further examples of these experiments, it may be helpful to consider why such a form as the dramatic lyric should have suggested itself to the poet as a means of his poetic self-realization.

Dramatic Lyrics was first published in 1842 (the volume included, however, two items of his which had already appeared in 1836 in *The Monthly Repository*). Prior to 1842 Browning had published three longish or long non-dramatic poems, ("Pauline", 1833, "Paracelsus", 1835, and "Sordello", 1840), two full scale dramas (*Strafford*, 1837, *King Victor and King Charles*, 1842), and a novel experiment in play-making, *Pippa Passes*, 1841, which consists of four playlets bound together in an original framework. Although of these perhaps only *Pippa Passes* would be put amongst the greater works of Browning, they provide an illuminating introduction to Browning's poetry. In fact, they show the poet trying to find himself both as man and as poet. As a man, he is becoming more intimately aware of his own nature and of his relation to the world and the universe about him. As a poet, he is seeking an instrument which at one and the same time will clarify his own sense of things and will transmit that sense to the rest of men with a minimum of distortion. That, after all, is the eternal problem of every poet. A poet must find his idiom: until he finds it, he himself has not quite realized what he

wants to say. In discovering what he wants to say, he finds his way of saying it. Although for analytic convenience one talks of these as of two distinct processes—as, similarly, one talks of form and content—in reality they are neither disjunctive nor discontinuous : they interact continuously and inseparably.

On what Browning wanted to say, the three non-dramatic poems, "Pauline", "Paracelsus", and "Sordello", throw much light ; they are even more revealing of the man because of their artistic imperfections. In his search for his own way of saying his say, the dramas confirm such deductions as could be drawn from the non-dramatic poems.

As far as a prevailing theme can be discerned in the obscurities and confusions of the three non-dramatic poems, it would appear that the poet is preoccupied with the nature and significance of self. In "Pauline", he says

I am made up of an intensest life,
Of a most clear idea of consciousness
Of self, distinct from all its qualities,
From all affections, passions, feelings, powers ;
And thus far it exists, if tracked, in all :
But linked, in me, to self-supremacy,
Existing as a centre to all things,
Most potent to create and rule and call
Upon all things to minister to it ;
And to a principle of restlessness
Which would be all, have, see, know, taste, feel, all—
This is myself ; and I should thus have been
Though gifted lower than the meanest soul.

The author called his "Pauline" a fragment of a confession, and, whilst it should be remembered that it is not explicitly an autobiographical confession, it was clear to others, and became very clear later to Browning himself (hence his long refusal to reprint), that the poem did reflect its author. In Browning's person, this consciousness of self was prior to any systematized view of life ; indeed, it is more like a form of sensation which is establishing itself as an intuition, and appears even more physiological in its foundation than psychological. Linked as it is, in the confession, "to self-supremacy, existing as a centre to all things", it is a voracious appetite for all varieties of experience : it seeks to use life at large merely as an instrument for

the realization of selfness. All things must minister to it ; and it exists in a state of insatiable restlessness " which would be all, have, see, know, taste, feel all ". In its course the poem " Pauline " records the failure of this system of conduct as a mode of living. It ends, not in satisfaction, but in despondency. Even so, the grounds of the failure are but dimly presented : they appear merely as vague emotional apprehensions rather than as comprehensible truths. This is equally true of the suggested way of escape from the despondency, by love of Pauline : for why Pauline should love him and what he means by the love of Pauline remain empty figments of fancy and, in no wise, imaginative realities.

There is, however, another aspect of Browning's strong consciousness of self which moves more directly to a resolution of his own intellectual confusion. To feel that a sense of self is the primary consciousness in the condition of being alive is to be born an individualist. Browning, indeed, was an extreme individualist in an age of rampant individualism. In fact, his individualism had been a physiological sensation before it attained any intellectual status. It is perhaps not too much of a strain to say that his way of seeing things, that is, of merely using his physical eyes to see physical things, seems to indicate that as organs of vision his eyes functioned in such a way that he saw lines and edges rather than masses and bodies. For lines are the bastions of the individual ; they are what separates him from things not himself, and so establish the integrity of his selfhood. Browning was therefore much more alertly conscious of differences between things than of similarities. Hence inevitably, he had to encounter the full force of the individualist's intellectual problem. If self is sacrosanct, so is the self of all other selves. Self is meaningless unless it connotes autonomy. Hence the world of men is a chaos of hurtling and independent atoms. Such an idea, in its turn, is unthinkable. Hence Browning's fundamental intellectual objective, to find a unifying power which could transform a chaos into a universe, and at the same time would guarantee the integrity of self and preserve its essential autonomy. It was along this trend of his awareness that Browning ultimately found in Christianity his own solution

of the human dilemma. In "Pauline" he had recognized amongst the earliest of his intuitions, "a need, a trust, a yearning after God". But until Elizabeth Barrett's influence on him became definitive, his need for what then he was to find in Christianity remained unfulfilled by the expedients which his intellect and his imagination suggested to him.

It is this frustrated period of his growth which is behind "Paracelsus" and "Sordello". Both of them revert obscurely or more obviously, to the primary problem, the nature and the rights of self. In "Pauline", self undoes itself in selfishness ; in "Paracelsus", self fails to achieve its own selfhood, even through efforts calculated to serve the needs of other selves. As in "Pauline", however, so in "Paracelsus", the intellectual thread of the argument becomes confused ; it is clouded by a too drastic logical simplification. Paracelsus had, he tells us, desired "to know" ; he had found himself unable "to love". The dichotomy is factitious ; it is verbal rather than actual. Moreover, stated so, it shifts the problem from a metaphysical to a psychological plane. On that plane, the sequence of Paracelsus's attainments and failures, as the tracing of the personal experiences of a given individual, has some sort of poetic conviction. But the intellectual problem on which the whole structure is raised has been jettisoned or side-tracked. The ending of the poem, almost as patently as that of "Pauline", provides much more of an emotional than of a philosophic satisfaction. What perhaps is the main import of the poem is that once more it expresses Browning's persisting, but as yet only partially realized, sense of the importance of love in life. Yet neither the personal and private assertion of that value in "Pauline", nor the attempted demonstration of its social and philanthropic efficacy in "Paracelsus" had established themselves as more than sentimental or emotional moods. They were not yet palpable requisites of a universe. Indeed, the most magnificent passages in "Paracelsus", those leading up to, and continuing from, the lines

Savage creatures seek
Their loves in wood and plain, and God renews
His ancient rapture. . . .

are more like a splendid formulation of the problem than any sort of solution to it.

In some way, "Sordello" helps to clarify the situation, if not the problem. For instance, in "Paracelsus", and even in its final summary, the way to happiness was to be found through

Knowledge, not intuition, but the slow
Uncertain fruit of an enhancing toil,
Strengthened by love.

In "Sordello", despite the thick incrustation of specious intellectual profundities, the substance is almost entirely determined by psychological and emotional compulsions. The abstract, the universal, the rational, the domain of pure reason, have no operative part in the making of the poem. Sordello seeks the fulfilment of his selfhood; his search is guided, and often misguided, by his imagination or rather by his fancy: in the end, by what is presented as an act of sudden moral insight, he realizes in a flash that the way to the fulfilment of self is by service and sacrifice. But the ending lacks imaginative compulsion. It is no more than a particular solution to Sordello's particular problem: it neither seeks nor attains universal substantiation. It does indicate, however, the romantic young poet's growing sense that love is more than the passion of man for woman; it comprehends the "charity" which is the Authorized Version's word for what an ancient Greek would have called "philanthropy", the love of man for his fellow men. Browning was soon to find by faith the consummation of this concept of love in the Christian doctrine of the love of God. It was, however, through his human love for Elizabeth Barrett that he reached this primary article of his faith. In the meantime, "Sordello" marks the definite formulation of service, that is, of disinterested willingness to give all for the good of others, as that vital sense of love which links the passion of man for woman with the charity which is the instrument of social well-being.

Perhaps psychologically Browning himself had come by another way to Sordello's conclusion. As the individual he was, he was preoccupied with incidents in the development of

the souls of men. He saw this development as a continuous product of the interplay of soul and circumstance. Man lived within the

plastic dance of circumstance,
Machinery just meant to give his soul its bent.

In the more tangible elements of this circumstance, other human selves were, of course, the most potent forces. Hence Browning's supreme interest : it was in men and women, in the universal theatre in which humanity lives its life. Of course, other poets have found this theme absorbing ; and in the main they have been poets who have found that they could best project their interests by employing the art, technique, and form of drama. For one of the outstanding organic functionings of drama is its capacity to " imitate " or represent those conflicts between man and man, or man and circumstance, by which he moves to his triumph or undoing. It had been the individualism of the Renaissance which inspired Marlowe, and, after him, other Elizabethans, to make the portrayal of character the main dynamic instrument in the energizing of tragedy. Hence Browning, too, was soon led to seek the same artistic medium through which to reflect his own predominant interests in the spectacle of human life. His first poem, " Pauline," had been in form a monologue in which the speaker recounts stretches of his past life and their emotional, and sometimes spiritual, consequences. But the stretches never culminated in realizable episodes, nor crystallized as specific incidents. Hence the portrait presented was an indeterminate coagulation of morbid moods, of which the aches and pains remain as unintelligible as those of a dyspeptic jelly-fish. Before Browning could make the human problems of his men and women appear real, the world outside them, the world in which they lived, and the world from which their problems arose, had somehow or other to be brought into the stuff of the poem. In " Paracelsus " there is Browning's first overt recognition of the fact that his own special concerns in human experience are those which have generally been reflected through the medium of drama. Yet " Paracelsus " is not a play. It is a poem with speaking participants. It is not in acts and scenes : it has, however, five

parts, each geographically located. But there is no pretence of a stage-like dramatization. Each part consists largely of harangues by Paracelsus, sparsely punctuated by the comments of one or other of the few additional persons of the caste. Even then, there is no real dialogue: there are spoken ruminations and arguments. Above all, there is no action: there are mere recountings of actions past or actions projected; and, although there are brief interspersed descriptions of the immediate scenario, there is no attempt to make the local environment dramatically effective from scene to scene. Yet the theme of "Paracelsus" demands the effective representation of men and women in the mass; for Paracelsus claims that his way of fulfilling his own self is a universal benefaction to all other selves, and he scorns those other selves for not recognizing his own superior selfness. Such a conflict could only be made fully dramatic in a fully dramatic form.

It was at this point in his artistic career that Browning was asked to write a play proper. To do so, he set aside the third non-dramatic poem on which he was engaged, "Sordello", which was ultimately to appear in 1840. "Sordello" is less dramatic in form than anything else from Browning's pen. It is narrative, and narrative which, however it blunts its own story, does at least indicate that Browning had realized that, in order to have his own sense of life reflected in his poems, it was essential to have mirrored within them their attendant world, the particular and general environment of the persons who were his protagonists. Indeed, "Sordello" is well-nigh smothered in the mass of its narrative circumstance.

But for the next few years it was to the theatre that Browning turned. He found that, although there was something essentially dramatic in his own sense of life, there was something essential to drama which was lacking in him. The root of the trouble was that Browning's sense of individual values made him oblivious of the power of corporate and social forces. His first play, *Strafford*, dealt with the Cavalier-Roundhead political scene. But Browning never grasped how the political beliefs of the two parties had acquired activating power as human motives. The play is worked out as the merely personal

and private antagonisms of its characters. In his next play, *King Victor and King Charles*, the plot turns on the strategic transfer of a crown from father to son ; but the transaction is conducted as personally as if it were no more than the commercial transfer of a private business. It is much the same in Browning's other attempts at formal drama. Of course, in all of them there is in form some representation of the immediate world in which the social implication of the individual's actions would be apparent ; but it remains an insensitive and sterile world. People other than the major characters become mere theatrical properties rather than social human beings. For instance, the retinue in *A Blot in the Scutcheon* are automata who merge in the theatrical backcloth. In effect, Browning's pre-occupation with the individual was so intense that it prevented his giving life to more than one or two at a time. His plays often comprise one or two protagonists, and a number of characterless names. They are best when he severely limits the number of *dramatis personae*, as, for instance, in the scenes which make up *Pippa Passes*, or in *A Soul's Tragedy*. Perhaps his most characteristic, though not his best, play is *Colombe's Birthday*. In it, a princess willingly cedes a throne to a claimant in order to live in a cottage as the wife of an idealist who, in his turn, lays aside his passion for the social betterment of the poor in order for ever undisturbed to sit at the hearth of domestic bliss. Such an easy contempt for corporate, social, communal values when weighed against private and personal ones, amply indicates what qualities in his sense of life made it certain that Browning would never be a successful writer of plays. The drama would not provide the means of his artistic fulfilment.

Hence his artistic predicament : for indubitably much in his attitude to life was acutely aware of its dramatic elements. Inevitably, he would be driven to find a form which, whilst being dramatic, would be able to dispense with some of the implications and components which inhere in formal drama. His drama would dispense with the theatre, but would erect a stage in the readers' mind. The way to this had already presented itself. Already in 1836, Browning had hit on the prototypes of his new form : he had written and published "Porphyria " and

"Johannes Agricola" (both of which he reprinted in the 1842 *Dramatic Lyrics*, where they were linked together under a composite sub-title *Madhouse Cells*).

When "Johannes Agricola" appeared in 1836, Browning attached to it a brief note explaining that Agricola was an early sixteenth century Protestant divine, who founded the sect of Antinomians, that is, of men who rejected the Mosaic law and adopted the Gospel dispensation : for them, no man could earn salvation by holiness or by works. The poem is Browning's portrait of a religious fanatic, a madman. Its title in the 1849 collected poems was "Johannes Agricola in Meditation", a title which hardly suggests a promising setting for drama.

The poem begins with Johannes sitting alone on his open balcony gazing at the night sky, and, having seen behind it the confirmation of his own salvation, he rests his head meditatively on his hand, with his elbow leaning on the desk in front of it, and in this posture he rehearses the credal assurances of his faith. That is all there is of visible movement in the poem. But it is at least sufficient to allow the setting and the immediate scene to be visualized. As soon as Johannes opens his mouth, the potential occupant of a Madhouse Cell is apparent : we are listening to an intellectual fanatic, a doctrinal maniac. The premises which he takes as axiomatic lead him to recount horrifying examples of their consequences ; in a tone of intellectual melodrama luridly illustrated, he recites scene after scene until at the end the dramatist arranges a superb intellectual finale, a turn of the argument which has the surprise of a stage dénouement, and reveals for the first time a strand of real human insight behind the fanatic's ravings.

Agricola starts with a proud and confident assertion of his own immunity to everything which might seem to bar his way to God :

There's heaven above, and night by night
I look right through its gorgeous roof ;
No suns and moons though e'er so bright
Avail to stop me ; splendour-proof
I keep the broods of stars aloof :

Without fear and indeed with eager joy he foresees what will be his last journey, through death, to God :

For I intend to get to God,
 For 'tis to God I speed so fast,
 For in God's breast, my own abode,
 Those shoals of dazzling glory, passed,
 I lay my spirit down at last.

He is certain of the joy there laid up for him and declares the doctrinal basis of his faith :

I lie where I have always lain,
 God smiles as he has always smiled ;
 Ere suns and moons could wax and wane,
 Ere stars were thundergirt, or piled
 The heavens, God thought on me his child.

Certain of his own predestined salvation, he is moved to wider sweeps of confidence :

Ordained a life for me, arrayed
 Its circumstances every one
 To the minutest ; ay, God said
 This head this hand should rest upon
 Thus, ere he fashioned star or sun.
 And having thus created me,
 Thus rooted me, he bade me grow,
 Guiltless for ever, like a tree
 That buds and blooms, nor seeks to know
 The law by which it prospers so.

The certainty becomes even more absolute ; for Agricola's salvation is not intended for his own gratification, it is through God's will and for God's sole pleasure :

But sure that thought and word and deed
 All go to swell his love for me,
 Me, made because that love had need
 Of something irreversibly
 Pledged solely its content to be.

Hence the contrast between his own lot and that of the un-regenerate :

Yes, yes, a tree which must ascend,
 No poison-gourd foredoomed to stoop !
 I have God's warrant, could I blend
 All hideous sins, as in a cup,
 To drink the mingled venoms up ;
 Secure my nature will convert
 The draught to blossoming gladness fast :
 While sweet dews turn to the gourd's hurt,
 And bloat, and while they bloat it, blast,
 As from the first its lot was cast.

With fervent zeal he treats himself in anticipation to post-mortem peerings into the hell wherein the damned will writhe :

For as I lie, smiled on, full fed
By unexhausted power to bless,
I gaze below on hell's fierce bed,
And those its waves of flame oppress,
Swarming in ghastly wretchedness.

It is a hell filled with the damned, damned all of them not through their own sins ; on the contrary, through the mere choice of God : with proud and assured superiority, Agricola surveys these innocent victims :

Whose life on earth aspired to be
One altar-smoke, so pure !—to win
If not love like God's love for me,
At least to keep his anger in ;
And all their striving turned to sin.
Priest, doctor, hermit, monk grown white
With prayer, the broken-hearted nun,
The martyr, the wan acolyte,
The incense-swinging child,—undone
Before God fashioned star or sun !

The narrow logic of unreason never invented a more distorted system. But as Agricola's ecstasy reaches its climax, there comes the magnificent—and unexpected—curtain :

God, whom I praise ; how could I praise,
If such as I might understand,
Make out and reckon on his ways,
And bargain for his love, and stand,
Paying a price, at his right hand?

For in this last stanza, Agricola's sense of the ineffable and inscrutable majesty of the Almighty expresses itself as a humility which never doubts that even to question God's will is the height of human arrogance, the "superbia" of sacrilege and profanity. For a brief moment one is given a glimpse behind the intellectual and spiritual vauntings which have filled the poem ; a sort of momentary historic illumination humanizes the ravings of religious fanaticism.

At the end, however, the degree of dramatization attained in the poem is very limited. The theme is without conflict ; time, place and circumstance are largely dispensed with ; all that

happens happens invisibly in the mind. Moreover, though the man depicted is dramatic, he is dramatic not because he is representatively human, but because he is grossly abnormal ; and a poem which can only be dramatic by confining its *dramatis personae* to lunatics and monsters does not seem to hold promise of large human significance. There is much more dramatization in the other of Browning's first two attempts at the dramatic lyric, that is, " Porphyria's Lover ". In a Rylands lecture given fourteen years ago, " Browning the Dramatist ", I used the poem for the argument of that lecture : I now repeat from it what appears relevant to today's subject.

" Porphyria " almost stages itself to the mind's eye as a theatrical one-act thriller. The episode which is its plot is in itself a striking situation ; tension is stretched, turn by turn, until with a sharp twist of the action the climax of the incident is reached, and this itself prepares a *dénouement* which, avoiding anticlimax by its unexpectedness, achieves a magnificently theatrical curtain. But it is not merely by its plotcraft that " Porphyria " reaches drama. It is rich in the technical accessories of dramatization. Action is symbolic of character. Words call up the situation as a scene, supplying back-cloth and properties, limelight and black-outs ; and the monstrosity of the tale is subdued to the necessary realism of drama by a deft choice of apparently casual appurtenances, shawls and gloves and kitchen-pokers, from the routine of familiar everyday life. Most remarkable of all is the skill shown in experimenting with a technique for supplying to the dramatic monologue the equivalents of what in drama proper is provided by the visible scene. A play opens with its situation exposed in space, its actors seen in one and the same moment amidst all the circumstances of their environment. But in the monologue, detail of setting and hints of character can only come separately one after the other in rapid temporal succession. Everything turns on the particular detail chosen and the order of its occurrence, so that as the tale tells itself the scene is being built in the right perspective and the clues have their right direction and momentum. Only thus will the reader " produce " the coming play rightly, and cast its person as the sort of man he is meant to be. The reader

must grasp as soon as he can what sort of a person is speaking and under what circumstances he speaks.

The rain set early in to-night :

The splash of rain off-stage ; the scene, the darkness of night.

The sullen wind was soon awake :

the moan, and then the growl, of wind, and with it the first clue to the speaker's mood or character : " sullen wind ", " awake " —one who feels that nature is a demoniacal and hostile power.

It tore the elm-tops down for spite :

roar of gale and crash of branches in the wings ; back-stage probably opening on a plantation—trees all of one kind, and they, elms, frailest of all giants in a tempest, most opulently impressive, however, on a baronial estate ; and the scene defines itself more closely as the edge of a lordly park : the speaker's sense of nature's hostility increasing—" for spite ".

And did its worst to vex the lake :

the swish of waters lashed by wind ; the scene, certainly now abutting on a park, part of a large estate ; the speaker's sense of the destructive might of the monster, nature, growing to morbidity.

I listened with heart fit to break.

A dim figure, peering into the black storm, every nerve strained to feed itself on the storm's fury and its own misery :

When glided in Porphyria.

Unheard, Porphyria silently glides in. Why a door ajar on a night like this ? Morbid self-pity becoming madness ?

straight

She shut the cold out and the storm
And kneeled and made the cheerless grate
Blaze up, and all the cottage warm.

The scene is slowly illumined with firelight ; it is the inside of a cottage, cheerless, on such a night, with open door and fire dying in the grate. On her entrance, Porphyria restores more comfortable warmth and a cosy half-light. But what is she doing here ? With a name like that, Porphyria, too ? An aristocrat, probably, perhaps connected with the lord of the

manor who owns this cottage on his estate. But is she a romantic sentimentalist, a heartless vamp? So far, at all events, her actions are those of a sensible practical woman with an eye for the obvious and matter-of-fact :

Which done, she rose, and from her form
Withdrew the dripping cloak and shawl
And laid her soiled gloves by, untied
Her hat and let the damp hair fall.

Porphyria's common-sense is abundantly clear. She shuts the door and pokes the fire before taking off her soiled white gloves ; but that done, in a normal straightforward way she removes her wet coat, methodically unties her hat, without tugging excitedly at its strings, and shakes her tresses loose to let them dry. But why should such a matter-of-fact lady have come to see such a man under such circumstances on such a night ?

And, last, she sat down by my side
And called me.

So far there has been no sound of human voice. Having put things in order, Porphyria sits by the man's side. Is she then his lady-love? She breaks the silence by speaking his name. But he is the oddest of lovers, if lover he be :

When no voice replied—

apart from no lover-like greeting, not even a word of gratitude for tidying the room! Clearly, he is in the most trying of difficult moods. She knew, apparently, that the fit would be on him, as anybody who remembers to shut doors during a storm and to poke dying fires would know ; but she hardly expected—and who could expect?—that it would be as bad as it is. In such a desperate situation drastic remedies may be worth risks, even up to the semblance of impropriety.

When no voice replied
She put my arm about her waist,
And made her smooth white shoulder bare
And all her yellow hair displaced
And stooping made my cheek lie there,
And spread o'er all, her yellow hair.

Admittedly, it looks almost like seduction. But the bare shoulder is unavoidable if you are in a dance-frock, and if you

ever"—a poor prize, one might think, to people as normal as those who like doors to be closed and fires to be warm on stormy nights. The relation of Porphyria to the protagonist is becoming clear. His view of her visit on such a night is, of course, as he says, that

passion sometimes would prevail.

But prevail against what vainer ties ?

Nor could to-night's gay feast restrain

A sudden thought of one so pale

For love of her.

Porphyria's father is giving a dinner and a dance at the hall to his aristocratic friends. The young man has moped and sulked, doubtless telling her in tones of poetic despair and high-minded contempt, that whilst she is flaunting it at the ball, he'll be staring into blankness with heart fit to break. So, slipping away from her father's guests, she has run across the park to see whether the young man is as bad as he threatened to be. One can only guess how she came to be involved with him. The advent of a young poet or artist to live in the cottage on the edge of the estate must have been quite exciting in the isolation of an early Victorian country house. At all events, encountering him on her walks has relieved the tedium of a dull life. She has certainly not been above flirtation ; and so it has gone on, to a point, one suspects, when she has begun to wish it were all over. But she has not misled him into thinking she was deeply in love with him : it is only a " sudden " thought, he tells us, which brings her to see him,

So pale

For love of her, and all in vain ;

So, she was come through wind and rain.

—But she had taken the obvious precautions against the inclement weather, sensible in this as in the other things we know of her, except, of course, for the fact that though she must have known that she had been playing with matches, she had not realized what sort of a conflagration would be kindled :

Be sure I looked up at her eyes

Happy and proud.

Evidently her tactics were availing to restore some sort of more

normal temper in this moody melancholic ; even so, his gloomy silence is still maintained :

at last I knew
Porphyria worshipped me.

That, of course, is his opinion, not ours, nor Porphyria's ; as he goes on to admit—

surprise
Made my heart swell and still it grew
While I debated what to do.

—a curiously inept choice for a debating time : but his ecstasy has brought him to madness.

That moment she was mine, mine, fair
Perfectly pure and good : I found
A thing to do, and all her hair
In one long yellow string I wound
Three times her little throat around
And strangled her.

Then follows a gruesome orgy : he fondles her corpse.

No pain felt she ;
I am quite sure she felt no pain,
As a shut bud that holds a bee.
I warily oped her lids : again
Laugh'd the blue eyes without a stain.
And I untighten'd next the tress
About her neck ; her cheek once more
Blush'd bright beneath my burning kiss :
I propp'd her head up as before,
Only, this time my shoulder bore
Her head, which droops upon it still.

His ruminations are nauseating with their lunatic self-satisfaction :

The smiling rosy little head,
So glad it has its utmost will,

(a curious misapprehension of a girl who likes sensible creature-comforts like warm fires)—

That all it scorned at once is fled.

(What indeed did Porphyria scorn ? Certainly nothing that made for natural well-being and provided for a *joie-de-vivre*):

And I, its love, am gained instead !

(truly a great gain !)

Porphyria's love : she guessed not how
Her darling one wish would be heard.

Most certainly she did not : if she had had the faintest notion that this was to be the upshot of her visit, she would certainly have stayed on at the ball.

And thus we sit together now
And all night long we have not stirred,

—a fine Grand Guignol tableau : and then the magnificent curtain :

And yet God has not said a word !

The next word is surely rather with the village policeman than with God. But as this homicidal lunatic sits expecting the heavens to open and a voice to descend therefrom, his monomania reaches its climax. The foetid stifling atmosphere of the gruesome scene is dissolved, for the madman's characteristic speculation hurls the minds of the spectators momentarily to the outermost limits of restorative space, where, if at all, the relation of God to this sordid crime is to be sought for.

Such, then, were the prototypes of the dramatic lyric, and as Browning continued to go from failure to failure with his formal plays, he turned more and more to this form of unstaged drama, in which he was freer to leave out so many of those appurtenances of human society which thrust themselves onto the physical stage. For instance, without incongruity, he leaves the police force out of "Porphyria's Lover", though when he left them out of the Ottima-Sebald episode in *Pippa Passes* the omission was glaring. It is also worth noting that the two first dramatic lyrics which we have just surveyed deal, one with religion, and one with the theme of love. In due course these themes, together with that of artists and their art, were to be the three recurrent subjects of Browning's greatest dramatic lyrics, although they do not bulk prominently in the first collected volume which Browning published in 1842 as *Dramatic Lyrics*, nor in the second, *Dramatic Romances and Lyrics*, 1845.

In general, in these first two collections the poet appears to be exploring the range of the dramatic lyric, and feeling for its specific function or its most efficient form. In the 1842 volume, for instance, there are lyrics which are dramatized only in the sense that they are songs appropriate to a recognized historical

type or group of men. "Cavalier Tunes", for example, ring with the gaiety, insouciance, and levity of the traditional Royalist. In the main, they characterize a type only, as, for instance, does "Marching Along":

God for King Charles ! Pym and such carles
To the Devil that prompts 'em their treasonous parles !
Cavaliers, up ! Lips from the cup,
Hands from the pasty, nor bite take nor sup
Till you're—
Marching along, fifty-score strong, etc., etc.

In the other two of the three "Cavalier Tunes", what emerges from the representative type is something nearer to a particular person, and dramatic characterization is thereby enhanced. The first two stanzas of "Give a Rouse" present to us the traditional Cavalier—with his

Who gave me the goods that went since ?
Who raised me the house that sank once ?
Who helped me to gold I spent once ?
Who found me in wine you drank once ?

But in more ways than one he becomes a distinct person in the third stanza :

To whom used my boy George quaff else,
By the old fool's side that begot him ?
For whom did he cheer and laugh else,
While Noll's damned troopers shot him ?

So also in the third of the three "Tunes", "Boot and Saddle", the singer rises from type to individual in the last stanza :

Who ? My wife Gertrude ; that, honest and gay,
Laughs when you talk of surrendering, Nay !
I've better counsellors ; what counsel they ?

In general, dramatization becomes more effective when the subject is a person caught in a crucial incident, where the situation gives the first impetus to the dramatic, and the characterization becomes dramatic in its turn to whatever extent the circumstance requires. "The Incident of the French Camp" is, as its title claims, merely an incident, but an incident held in dramatic tension by not being permitted to relax into dramatic narrative, always a danger to the dramatized lyric: for the Browning of "The Pied Piper" (1842) and "The Flight of

the Duchess " (1845) could very effectively dramatize narrative. Where, however, narrative determines the scope, the dynamic efficacy of the dramatized lyric is diminished, and the consequent achievement has an imaginative function different from that of the dramatic lyric. The collection of 1845 has even wider variations of the form than has the 1842 volume, and less concentration, therefore, on the particular stamp of dramatic lyric which by 1855 had become its prevailing shape. Moreover, the 1845 collection ranges more loosely from the scarcely-dramatized to the well-nigh completely dramatized. Much of this scarcely-dramatized consists of "occasional" pieces : "Home Thoughts from Abroad", "Nationality in Drinks", "Garden Fancies", "Italy in England", "England in Italy", and even "The Lost Leader". In both volumes, however, there are one or two examples of the dramatic lyric in almost complete realization. In 1842, there were "My Last Duchess" and "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister". May be the psychological convincingness of the Duke in the former of these is not so much created by the poem itself as taken over into it from Renaissance history : may be, too, the venom of the monk in the second allows itself too much comic licence to pass for serious portraiture. But in both poems, the technique by which a particular scene is dramatized to minute and unbroken visualization of its succeeding moods and gestures is a masterly example of the art of imaginative suggestion. In the 1845 volume there is "The Bishop Orders his Tomb at St. Praxed's", which needs as much historical warrant as does "My Last Duchess" to justify the character of the protagonist, but which, more than does "My Last Duchess", generates the very atmosphere and odour of that warranty within itself : it is the historic past recalled in vivid action. Also in the 1845 volume is "The Lost Mistress", which is equally expert in the new technique and at the same time shows that the new form need not rely for its dramatic element, as so far it had so often done, on the choice of a highly abnormal type of person for protagonist.

Perhaps the degree of attainment in the making of the dramatic lyric up to 1845 can be illustrated most succinctly by looking more closely at two short poems both of which deal with a

broken love affair, "Cristina" from the 1842 volume, and "The Lost Mistress" from that of 1845.

"Cristina" is said to have suggested itself to Browning by an incident in Spain in 1840. Since 1833, Cristina, widow of the late King of Spain and herself a King's daughter, had been acting as regent on behalf of her infant daughter. She was well known for her addiction to the gay frolics and delights of high life: when, however, it was found in 1840 that she had married a commoner, an officer in the army, she was forced to resign. Hence, Browning's title suggests the aristocratic coquette. The poem is obviously spoken by a man whom the world would regard as one of her casual and unintended victims, but who, we shall find, strangely looks on himself as having secured through the episode an incalculable spiritual wealth. We overhear him talking to an acquaintance (say, to us the readers), to whom he has just told how once he had chanced to have been at a crowded *soirée*, where he had happened to catch the eye of the lady of the evening, Cristina. At that point the poem starts: as soon as the speaker opens his mouth to continue the story, we are aware of something curious in his temperament and personality:

She should never have looked at me
If she meant I should not love her!

It is an odd proposition, especially as possibly and (as we shall soon know) even certainly, the look was no more than a glance from a sparkling eye, as the lady gaily and graciously looked round the whole assembly. But, of course, the speaker takes it for granted that, on a man like himself, so much more sensitive than other mortals, the effect of even a momentary glance must be vastly different from its effect on men of common clay:

There are plenty . . . men, you call such,
I suppose . . . she may discover
All her soul to, if she pleases,
And yet leave much as she found them:
But I'm not so, and she knew it
When she fixed me, glancing round them.

How did she know, and what was it she knew? That here was a man so much superior to all the others? For evidence that she had such knowledge, he tells us no more than that her eye

"fixed" him, whilst it merely glanced at the others. But what was this odd "fixing"—and we have only his word that it was different from the glance all the others had? Perhaps, indeed, there was something odd in his look, as we have already suspected there was in his nature: and maybe, that oddness had caused Cristina's eyes to dwell a second or so longer on him than on the others. As we listen to him, our attitude of scepticism is as clear to him as if we had said "Surely, you are making something out of nothing: its nonsense to say that you knew that she meant to inflame you with love". The very next words of the poem presupposes some such query from us: they are an example of a technique which Browning was skilfully developing and which relied on colloquial idiom, an interspersed word, or an ejaculation to suggest dramatically the resumption of a talk, or the recalling of a past incident in the manner of casual recollection.

What? to fix me thus meant nothing?

is clearly his reply to our unspoken expression of complete disbelief in his groundless tale. We have obviously gone on to ask what on earth the glance to which he attributes such piercing influence did or could mean.

What? To fix me thus meant nothing?
But I can't tell (there's my weakness)
What her look said!

His remark only confirms us in our certainty that his tale is a mere delusion, and that he himself is temperamentally given to such delusive fancies. One of them, for instance, was his conviction of his own superiority to the rest of mankind: far from mitigating this impression of his intellectual vanity, his confession "there's my weakness", enhances the effect of it; for we know already many more of his weaknesses than mere inability to put some experiences into words. Indeed we know forthwith that verbal infecundity is not one of his symptoms: for his next lines reveal his possession of the kind of literary fertility which would qualify him to join Theseus's group of afflicted fancy-ridden folk, lunatics, lovers and poets.

But I can't tell (there's my weakness)
 What her look said !—no vile cant, sure,
 About " need to strew the bleakness
 Of some lone shore with its pearl-seed.
 That the sea feels "—no " strange yearning
 That such souls have, most to lavish
 Where there's chance of least returning."

The phrases, and the romantic fancies they utter, are the mark of his mental make-up. He lives in the realm of his own fancy, continuously dramatizing himself and his environment, giving to airy nothing a local habitation and a name, translating a glance into a revelation. For surely the words he thinks Cristina might have said, but didn't say, are in a language unused by and unknown to the gay, pleasure-loving, socialite lady who is queening it at her reception or her levée. These are in a different key from what must have been her habitual drawing-room philanderings. As the speaker resumes, after this romantic improvization, he gives voice to two of the most frequently quoted of Browning's poetic utterances. They are the magnificent poetic expression of a series of moral aperçus which impress us as significant moral truths, truths, too, which Browning's other poems lead us to think were primary and substantial in his own moral philosophy.

Oh, we're sunk enough here, God knows !
 But not quite so sunk that moments,
 Sure tho' seldom, are denied us,
 When the spirit's true endowments
 Stand out plainly from its false ones,
 And apprise it if pursuing
 Or the right way or the wrong way,
 To its triumph or undoing.

There are flashes struck from midnights,
 There are fire-flames noondays kindle,
 Whereby piled-up honours perish,
 Whereby swollen ambitions dwindle,
 While just this or that poor impulse,
 Which for once had play unstifled,
 Seems the sole work of a life-time
 That away the rest have trifled.

In these stanzas the words have the ring of universal validity : to hear them from the mouth of a person who otherwise has shown himself to be submerged in mental delusion, serves to

lend to him for the moment the kind of truth to human nature which so many of the odder people in Browning's *dramatis personae* stand in need of. Yet the device provides this degree of technically necessary humanization without invalidating the universal moral value of the moral intuitions. All that the speaker says in his diagnosis of the general moral situation strikes home ; we concur in it as pertinent moral description : there are such moments, there are such flashes. But we decline to recognize the speaker's assumption that the lady's glance at him was indeed such a flash or moment. He knows, of course (and, again, through the Browning technique we know this) that we go on disbelieving his picture of himself :

Doubt you if, in some such moment,
As she fixed me, she felt clearly. . . .

We insist in our denial, and we re-affirm it with increased confidence when he tells us what Cristina's glance implied :

. . . she felt clearly,
Ages past the soul existed,
Here an age 'tis resting merely,
And hence fleets again for ages,
While the true end, sole and single,
It stops here for is, this love-way,
With some other soul to mingle ?

Else it loses what it lived for,
And eternally must lose it ;
Better ends may be in prospect,
Deeper blisses (if you choose it),
But this life's end and this love-bliss
Have been lost here. Doubt you whether
This she felt as, looking at me,
Mine and her souls rushed together ?

Still forcibly asserting our dissent, we half snigger at his version of this alleged spiritual welding, and we ask again for some sort of evidence. But

Oh, observe ! Of course, next moment,
The world's honours, in derision,
Trampled out the light for ever :
Never fear but there's provision
Of the devil's to quench knowledge
Lest we walk the earth in rapture !
—Making those who catch God's secret
Just so much more prize their capture !

The final stanza, however, brings the reader the dramatic dénouement, a sort of climacteric coda which gives the piece its really theatrical curtain. The speaker has seemed to be a man protesting that his heart had been broken by a callous woman on an occasion which, in our view, as we had tried to hint to him, had not been meant to have anything to do with the breaking of hearts. But how wrong we are, at least, in one part of our diagnosis of his feeling. In fact, he is no broken-hearted lover at all : he has triumphed in love :

Making those who catch God's secret
 Just so much more prize their capture !
 Such am I : the secret's mine now !
 She has lost me, I have gained her ;
 Her soul's mine : and thus, grown perfect,
 I shall pass my life's remainder.
 Life will just hold out the proving
 Both our powers, alone and blended :
 And then, come next life quickly !
 This world's use will have been ended.

It is Cristina, he tells us, who has been the loser, though neither she nor we can see her in that rôle—the Cristina at least, whom we know only from the particular incident staged in this poem. His own self-satisfaction has certainly achieved its object—

thus, grown perfect,
 I shall pass my life's remainder.

Obviously he has some considerable neurosis or other ; he is certainly not psychologically normal. At least, that is what the dramatizing of the poem renders him. We do not, of course, forget that a major article of Browning's moral creed was that very often apparent failure was in fact most success, and hence, that frustrated love often had a supreme satisfaction of its own. We remember, too, that sometimes Browning's belief in the efficacy of the love which is absolute seemed to make his account of its demands more sentimentally Victorian than was usual even amongst Victorian sentimentalists. But often the dramatizing of the sentimental relationship suggested, or even compelled, a fresh valuation of it. The reader, and, one believes, Browning

himself, often saw this love at the end of the drama as considerably different from what at the beginning it had been assumed to be. For instance, the lady's attitude both in "A Woman's Last Word", and in "Any Wife to Any Husband" is surely not one which Browning could have thought of as ideally desirable.

Our second illustration of Browning's acquisition of technical mastery by the year 1845, "The Lost Mistress", is an even clearer example. It involves a less abnormal situation, a situation not infrequently experienced, the breaking of a courtship. It stages itself in the reader's mind by Browning's exquisite economy in his choice of stage-properties, and by his endowing each one of these scenic appurtenances with activating power on the *dramatis personae*. His sparrows, his leaf-buds on the vine, and his snowdrops are charged with forces which determine the movements of man's mind and mood.

From the title, "The Lost Mistress", it is a fair guess to expect a disappointed lover talking about, and perhaps to, a girl who has just rejected him. We soon discover that he is in fact talking to her, though she remains mute. We discover, too, just where he is standing as he speaks: he is taking his last leave of her at her cottage gate immediately after she has finally and irrevocably broken her engagement to him. We soon get clues, too, to his nature, and, later, we get glimpses of hers.

"All's over then": so the poem starts. Definite, absolute, with the abrupt summary finality of the three brief words. He learns at once, and for ever, that there is no possibility of reconciliation. He accepts that as unalterable: and begins with a somewhat unexpected rumination:

All's over then: does truth sound bitter
As one at first believes?

This is not the remark of a man distraught with passionate grief. He makes no frenzied appeal to her. Is he merely stunned into insensitiveness? Or is he being curiously and inopportunistically introspective, more concerned with the mechanisms of emotion than with the experience of feeling it? At all events, few men standing where he stood and hearing what he had heard, would

immediately proceed to ask themselves the speciously philosophical question—"on first hearing irrevocable and bitter truth, does one at once feel any bitterness in it?" Is he indeed of a philosophical mind at all? Or must we seek other clues to his nature? His next words help us: his mind moves suddenly and unphilosophically from problems of truth to the sound of sparrows' twitterings:

does truth sound bitter
As one at first believes?
Hark, 'tis the sparrows' good-night twitter
About your cottage eaves!

As he stands vaguely uncertain how he is feeling, he hears sounds which have been familiar to him and to her every evening during their courtship, when, as he has babbled his sweet-nothings to her, he has asked her to notice how, above them in the eaves, sparrows were also twittering their own kind of goodnight partings. The remark gives the clue to the nature of the man, and, probably, of the lady. The happy hours of their courtship have been spent in the lanes and on the vine-clad slopes near the cottage. They have chattered together incessantly as they have caught the changing beauties of landscape and vegetation when season gave way to season. They have lived in a continuous state of sensuous innocence and simple delight. The rejected lover, we now see clearly, is no abstract thinker: he lives on his senses and on his nerves much more than on his mind. Indeed, his sensuous impressions prompt the succession of his thoughts in an order not imposed by their own rational consecutiveness. The sparrows provide him with the sensation of life as a recurrent and unending succession of natural events. The next perception confirms and extends the impression:

And the leaf-buds on the vine are woolly,
I noticed that, to-day;
One day more burst them open fully
—You know the red turns grey.

The second line is masterly, a sentence anybody could have spoken in ordinary colloquial prose—but that indeed is exactly what its poetic and dramatic significance is. It reveals the speaker's habitual response to life and the tone of his usual

converse. It is a sample of the interests of these two lovers, twittering together day after day as they have strolled through the countryside. They have been particularly and repeatedly stirred by sights of nature's incessant rebirths, its continuous processes, and, now, as the life-course of the vine-leaf shows, by natural growth to larger and larger fulfilment. The leaf-buds on the vine complete the apprehension which the sparrows began, the sense that in life there is no "all's over", no break, and that on the contrary, the law of nature appears to move all things forward to larger and larger life. (The "grey" must not mislead us by its more common symbolical usage to stand for decrepit old age: here, in the vineyard, it is a major stage preceding the full opening of the young leaves.) And so it comes about that the speaker, a man whose susceptibilities are mainly sensitive to sights and sounds about him, and whose mind takes its impressions from their prompting, is led in his next line to say

To-morrow we meet the same then, dearest ?

It seems incredible. Only eight lines before, he has heard and accepted as final the decision—"All's over". Now, in so short a time, this has dropped completely out of his consciousness. But, of course, the moment he formulates the phrase, that is, translates his apprehension into terms of intellectual discourse, his mind recalls that they are not to meet tomorrow. Yet, the phrase being spoken, it suggests another expedient. His sentiments seize on a chance for still further blanketing full recognition of the real situation. He plays with words. "The same" had first meant "as usual", i.e. as we have been doing, day after day. The mere saying it, however, has reminded him that they will not meet "as usual" tomorrow; but it has also provided him with further devices for not facing up to the irrevocable facts. Of course, they will not meet "by appointment". But suppose they should run into each other by chance? The meeting will not be the same. What will it be like? How precisely will it be conducted?

To-morrow we meet the same then, dearest ?

May I take your hand in mine ?

Mere friends are we,—well, friends the merest

Keep much that I resign.

This attempt to let sentiment soften the grief of the absolute separation has led his mind back, and at last he is trying to grasp the real facts ; he is recalling the sources of joy he is now to miss, the things he will most miss. The expression takes on a more vibrant and forceful rhythm :

For each glance of the eye so bright and black,
 Though I keep with heart's endeavour,—
 Your voice, when you wish the snowdrops back,
 Though it stay in my soul for ever !

In this stanza, passion almost breaks through sentiment. But not completely, for, always, the man's essential nature protectively intervenes to dull the edges of pain. He recalls the surge of his joy each time her bright and black eyes caught his : but he blunts the sorrow of its loss by inventing a theatrical substitute for what is lost—yet the suggested expedient, to preserve with heart's endeavour an everlasting replica of a glance, reveals the factitiousness of the proposal. The exquisite acuteness of his momentary sense of real loss is even more apparent when he thinks of her voice—"your voice when you wish the snowdrops back" : not only the musical and always delightful joy of an intimate sound, but her voice when it had caught its most entrancing tone, when, as winter was ending, it had eagerly uttered the rapture felt at the first glimpse of a snow-drop, the harbinger of the springtimes in which they both had revelled. And there is somewhat less artifice in the expedient offered to numb the pain of that deprivation : yet "though it stay in my soul for ever" is factitious, if not as mechanically so as is the "heart's endeavour". Indeed, it is now clear to all readers that the man to whom they are listening is a complete sentimentalist, a man whose consciousness of being alive resides mainly in his successive sensuous responses to his environment, and who is so absorbed in that mode of living that he relies on sentiment both as a direct enrichment of life and as a buffer against life's real griefs.

Though for a moment in the above stanza, he seemed to be breaking down this barrier, in his last stanza he reverts complacently to the rôle which he had dramatized for himself, the part of the great lover whose lady has turned from him. Feeling

is utterly lost in his toying with sentimental posturings and attitudes in which broken hearts are ostentatiously to be displayed on the sleeve. Seeming at last to accept the situation that all is over, he finds, not grief, but a sort of artificial satisfaction in devising a new code of etiquette for rejected lovers :

Yet I will but say what mere friends say,
Or only a thought stronger ;

(the nice calculation in imponderables will keep his fancy pre-occupied, to the exclusion of pain)—

I will hold your hand but as long as all may,
Or so very little longer !

—one can see him almost literally with stop-watch in hand, “ five seconds for others, but seven and a half for me ”.

So the poem ends. It is a magnificent example of the new and peculiar artistry of the dramatic lyric. It not only projects a personality : it constructs that personality by the successive impacts on it from objects presented in its own environment. Here, indeed, the interplay of man and circumstance is dynamically reproduced : and the machinery by which his human nature is shaped is displayed imaginatively in action. The invention provides a magnificent augury for what would emerge when Browning had been led by his wife to switch his imaginative explorations more frequently onto those conflicts of man and circumstance which determine not only man's mortal course, but his immortal destiny.

The dramatic lyric would show itself capable of projecting the most significant predicaments of human experience. When in due course Browning reached what to him was a satisfying religious faith, he found himself building it on what for him were a few, but those the entirely indispensable, articles of Christian belief. The crucial fact in it was the birth of Christ as, in the fullest literal sense, the veritable son, and the only son, of God. For that was the revelation of a God with attributes never before suspected, a God possessed not only of divine omnipotence, but equally possessed by the spirit of love. God was God, and man was man. As such they were as essentially and inherently different as the infinite differs from the finite,

as eternity differs from time. That part of the universe which was man's world was peopled by a mere swirl of autonomous midges, a world which, of itself, could never be ordered into a universe. But once, and once only, God gave tangible pledge of his love for man : He gave his only Son as a man to men. This unique miracle was the keystone of Browning's faith. It made God intelligible ; it authenticated revelation and intuition as avenues to truth ; it made love the supreme spiritual link in human and divine relationships ; and it assured man of immortality. As a poet, Browning had himself experienced moments of intenser sensitiveness when he felt himself aware of things normally hidden from man's vision and beyond the grasp of his rational mind. These creative moments of the artist were to him of similar nature to the exaltation by which the prophets attained to the sight of God and heard his law. Similarly again, though in lesser degree, the spiritual and sensuous excitement stimulated by human love, and especially, the love of man for woman, provided the bulk of mankind with his main opportunity for catching glimpses of ultimate reality. So, for Browning, the greatest poetry would be that in which the prophet or the artist or the lover was seen attaining those altitudes of sensibility from which the truth of God and the law of life became visible. In due course Browning's own greatest poetry was to occur in poems spoken by preachers and artists and lovers. They were poems which he gathered in the two volumes, *Men and Women*, of 1855 ; in them the dramatic lyric appears as a well-nigh perfect instrument for displaying these significant figures in the exercise of their most significant rôle.

But we must defer to another occasion illustrations of the dramatic lyric in perfection.

TWO BRITISH INTERPRETERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: ROBERT LOWTH (1710-1787) AND

SAMUEL LEE (1783-1852)¹

BY THE REV. R. S. CRIPPS, M.A., B.D.

WHEN invited to read a paper to the Society, I determined to speak upon the Exegesis and the Application of the Old Testament at the present time. As we know too well, an interpretation of the Old Testament which by-passes the critical work of well-nigh two centuries is wide-spread. Also, side by side with this, in spite of most commendable enterprises with a view to applying the Old Testament to today, is there not in fact a need for more attention to be given to the question of application? In short, do not we in this generation miss work of the character and calibre of, e.g. George Adam Smith's *Isaiah* (1887 and 1890) and *XII Prophets* (1896 and 1898) and Walter Adeney's *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther* (1893) and *Song of Solomon and Lamentations of Jeremiah* (1895)? These men, men of sound exegetical scholarship, using the principle of discrimination or selectivity, brought the vital message to bear upon the needs and problems of their own day—personal, national and international. In one and the same volume they combined application with exegesis.²

In order to illustrate the proposed double theme exegesis and application an examination was made of the relevant writings of Robert Lowth of the eighteenth century and Samuel Lee of the nineteenth. Although this study did not produce quite all the fruit which was sought in connection with what I call "application", these scholars seemed to be sufficiently

¹ A somewhat enlarged form of a paper read at the Winter Meeting of the Society for O.T. Study in January 1952. The year 1953 is the bi-centenary of Lowth's publication of his *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*.

² Cf. the answer G. A. Smith made to one of his reviewers in the Introduction to *XII Prophets*, vol. i: "One cannot conceive an ending, at once more pathetic and more ridiculous, to those great streams of living water, than to allow them to run out in the sands of criticism and exegesis, however golden these sands may be" (p. xi; 1928 edn., p. xiii).

interesting to warrant my dwelling upon them in this paper not less, but more, than had been originally intended. In fact, the paper has come to assume to some extent the form of a consideration of the work of these two British interpreters of the Old Testament. Reference will be made more particularly to the contribution of Lowth to O.T. scholarship.

Robert Lowth was born in 1710. There was a reason why he should be interested in Hebrew. He must have derived the taste for it from his father William Lowth, who produced commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the other prophets.¹

Lowth graduated from New College, Oxford. In 1741, only four years after he had received his M.A., Oxford took a step which was to constitute a landmark in the history of the scientific study of the O.T.² The office which the University conferred upon him was that of Professor of Poetry, and, most remarkably, the new professor chose to study the poetry of ancient Israel.

It was from this chair that he delivered a course of no fewer than thirty-four lectures entitled *De Sacrâ Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicæ*. In 1753 the lectures were published; and for their merit, in the following year, Lowth was awarded a D.D. The second edition (1763) contained some 220 pages of comments by Johann Michaëlis, Professor of Philosophy in Göttingen, who had already produced an annotated German translation of the Latin lectures. Early in 1765 Lowth was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of London and also of that of Göttingen.³ Not till 1787 did the lectures appear in English. The translation by the Rev. George Gregory, D.D. (1754-1808), with footnotes by Lowth himself, Professor Michaëlis and the translator, brought the work to 840 pages.

¹ These volumes are most easily available in Bishop Patrick's edition.

² In the year in which Lowth published his *Praelectiones* Astruc put forth his *Conjectures sur les mémoires . . . pour composer le livre de la Genèse*. It has been held that even this latter work had not the significance of Lowth's contribution to the critical study of the O.T. and the appreciation of Hebrew literature—which was scarcely equalled during almost another century and a half. Cf. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, p. 6.

³ Cf. the brochure *Memoirs of the Life and Writing of . . . R. Lowth*, published anonymously by his son Robert Lowth of Halstead in 1787, p. 24.

Meanwhile, we may remind ourselves that five years before Lowth's appointment as Praelector of Poetry, Bishop Francis Hare published a theory of Hebrew metre. Concerning this theory Lowth appended to his original edition of the *Praelectiones* and to that of 1763 what he called a *Brevis Confutatio*. In 1766 he issued his *Larger Confutation*. Referring to this latter seventy years afterwards, Peter Hall affirmed in a memoir prefacing Lowth's *Sermons and other Remains*, "Perhaps there never was a fallacy more accurately investigated or a system more completely refuted than that of the Hebrew metres of Bishop Hare". Specialists in Hebrew prosody today may not endorse this assertion, unless it is with emphasis upon the biographer's qualifying adverb "perhaps!" One thing is certain—that Lowth spared neither pains nor (very regrettably) invective and ridicule in "confuting" the metrical theory of his brother cleric.

And now to come to closer grips with Lowth's propositions upon Hebrew poetry. These were destined to play a vital part in his textual and exegetical methods; and eventually to influence profoundly future O.T. work, even though two generations later Gesenius had not fully appreciated the worth of this scholar. Of Lowth's treatment of Hebrew poetic form it will suffice to consider only rhythm and parallelism. This latter term has been in use ever since the master first applied it.

(a) Rhythm. Lowth died in 1787 and we have the witness of the *Preliminary Dissertation*¹ in his *Commentary on Isaiah*, published only nine years before his death, that he never saw reason to change his earliest view about precise metre. "A man born deaf may as reasonably pretend to acquire an idea of sound, as the critic of these days to attain to the true modulation of Greek by accent, and of Hebrew by metre." (Cf. Lecture III, Gregory, i. p. 67.) These vigorous words, however (springing partly from his distrust—like that of Kennicott—of the punctuation of the Massoretes), must not mislead us as to Lowth's positive convictions in the matter of rhythm in ancient Hebrew poetry. For he speaks of "measure, numbers or rhythm"² as a "safe conclusion"; and again of "some laws of metre,

¹ Pp. 11-13.

² English translation, ii. 43.

rhythm, harmony or cadence". Here he is putting forward the rhythmic principles enunciated by Azariah de Rossi, to whom fuller reference will be made in the next paragraph.

(b) Parallelism. This, the genius of ancient Hebrew poetry, will ever be associated with the name of Lowth. His definition of parallelism appears in the *Praelectio* XIX:¹ "The poetical conformation of the sentences . . . , characteristic of Hebrew poetry, consists chiefly in a certain equality, resemblance, or parallelism between members² of each period; so that in two lines . . . things for the most part shall answer to things, and words to words, as if fitted to each other by a kind of rule or measure." Elsewhere in this epoch-making lecture Lowth describes the phenomenon in five words: "The Prophetic Poetry is sententious".

The actual source of Lowth's Parallelism is expressly cited by him in the same *Praelectio* XIX.³ Here Lowth renders into English the brief Latin translation of Azariah de Rossi's *Light of the Eyes*⁴ in John Buxtorf junior's *Mantissa Aliquot Dissertationum*.⁵ In his *Preliminary Dissertation* a quarter of a century

¹ English Translation, ii. 43.

² In the Latin lecture "parallelismus membrorum".

³ English translation, ii. 54 ff.

⁴ קמור עינים Buxtorf, p. 418. R. Azariah (henceforth "de Rossi") published at Mantua in 1574 this work upon many subjects. One of these is Hebrew poetry (see especially *pereq.* LX. (In the Vilna edition of 1863 the vital page is *kerekh* ii, p. 208).

⁵ Buxtorf, to his fine edition of R. Judah ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Judah Hallevi's *Kitab Al Khazari*, appends various contributions of his own suggested by the text. These he entitles "An Addition" (*Mantissa*). His essay, *De Poesi Veteri Hebraica*, occupies pp. 406-29. The pronunciation כחרי (title-page) and (in his Latin version throughout) "Cosri" is without justification. (H. Hirschfeld's translation from the Arabic *Kitab Al Khazari*, 2nd edn. (1931), p. 282, n. 10.) Buxtorf, of course, always reproduces in the Hebrew text itself Tibbon's spelling, יהכחרי. A considerable part of Hallevi's treatise (composed in A.D. 1140) is in the form of a discussion between the Mohammedan king of the Arab tribe of the Khazars and a Rabbi. In part ii, §§ 69-72, the Jew contends, against the king, that in ancient Hebrew poetry strict metre (such as the Arabs employ) would be a defect. "Rhymed poems which are recited, and in which a good metre is noticeable, are neglected for something higher and more useful" (pt. ii, § 70). Al Khazari expresses himself satisfied (§ 81). This mere hint gave Buxtorf a chance to make his own positive contribution, and to cite Azariah de Rossi. To go behind Azariah, e.g. to Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508), is not the object of this paper.

later Lowth translated directly from the Hebrew, and, at greater length, the relevant section of de Rossi. This rendering brings out the force rather more clearly than Buxtorf's. "Whence", R. Azariah asked himself, "arises the metrical sweetness in Hebrew Songs absent from other parts of Scripture?" He finally came to the conclusion that: ¹ "The sacred songs have undoubtedly certain measures and proportions; ² which, however, consist not in the number of syllables, ³ perfect or imperfect . . . but in the number of things, and of parts of things; ⁴ that is, the subject, and the predicate, and their adjuncts, in every sentence and proposition. . . . 'Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah' (in Exod. xv. 6) is a phrase of two terms, or parts of a proposition; to which is connected, 'is-glorious in-power', consisting likewise of two terms: these joined together make four measures [or a tetrameter]: ⁵ 'Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah', repeated, makes two more; 'hath-crushed the-enemy', two more; which together make four measures [or a second tetrameter]." ⁶

We observe that de Rossi has in mind Parallelism. However, it was Lowth who first enunciated the principle clearly; he was the first to *develop* the theme. A century after Lowth excavations were to reveal Babylonian poetry with its parallelism. The idea nascent in de Rossi ¹ had to wait two centuries for the pen of Lowth to give it its appropriate names "Parallelismus membrorum" and "Parallelism". Moreover, though de Rossi brings out the poetry of verses from the Song of Moses, Habakkuk, Psalms, Proverbs and the Lamentations, yet it is Lowth alone who realizes that the prophets are for the most part poetry. For some evidence, cf. *Praelectio* XIX itself. This actually bears the title "Prophetic poetry". ⁷

¹ לבי אמר לי This expression is presumably intended by de Rossi to suggest originality on his part.

² מדות וערוכים

³ Motiones (Buxtorf). תנועות שלמות או בלתי שלמות

⁴ res (Buxtorf). במספר הענינים וחלקיהם

⁵ "or a tetrameter" is an explanatory addition of Buxtorf's.

⁶ "or a second tetrameter" occurs in Lowth only.

⁷ De Rossi was getting near this when he affirmed: *Quod si etiam recte expendas verba Cosri, videbis, illum ex parte attingere ea quae nos scripsimus; Imo oculi tui ipsi videbunt in Canticis Prophetis majorem excellentiam* (op. cit. p. 420 ad fin.).

Lowth found three sorts of parallelism which he named (a) "synonymous", (b) "antithetic", (c) "synthetic" (or "constructive"). So enthusiastic have some writers shown themselves about Lowth's contribution to the clear understanding of Hebrew poetic form that their words might lead the unwary to suppose that previously no one, not even the sacred poets themselves, knew how Hebrew verse was composed. As regards his classification of parallelism, of course he left considerable work to be done. And the studies of the late Professor Buchanan Gray show what a great modern scholar can say about Lowth's poetic theories, not only in the highest possible praise but in analytical and constructive criticism.¹

At this point it is convenient to consider two examples of how Lowth's theory of poetic form influenced his interpretation of the Received Text. In his *Preliminary Dissertation*, p. 35, he renders the root מָשַׁל in Isa. xxviii. 14, not as A.V., "that rule this people which is in Jerusalem", but, having regard to parallelism with "ye scoffers" in the preceding line, "ye who to this people in Jerusalem utter sententious speeches". Whatever may be our opinion of Lowth's translation, is it not surprising that it has attracted little attention? Gesenius-Buhl, however, renders "Spottversdichter" (as also in Ezek. xvi. 44). Again, how many commentators since Lowth's day have been able to explain convincingly why the four items enumerated by Isaiah in li. 19 could rightly be styled by the prophet "two things"? Lowth is not quite secure in his understanding of מַשַּׁל, but has not his interpretation, "desolation by famine, and destruction by the sword", force as well as attraction? See *Preliminary Dissertation*, p. 24, where Lowth cites Cant. i. 5 and Isa. xv. 3 as other instances of "parallelism arising from the alternation of the members of sentences".

However, it was pre-eminently Robert Lowth's emendation of the Massoretic Text,² partly on the grounds of Hebrew poetic form, that enabled him to shed a flood of light upon O.T. interpretation. Ten examples are here given. (Others will occur later in the course of argument, pp. 393-396.) Only from time to time does the commentator mention that he has used

¹ Gray, *op. cit.* ch. ii.

² Henceforth M.T.

poetic form as a criterion. Generally he leaves "the observant reader" of his version and notes to find this out for himself. (Cf. *Preliminary Dissertation*, p. 35.)

I. Emendations assisted by applying the principle of parallelism. (i) In Isa. xxviii. 18, "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled". Lowth (in loc. and *Prel. Diss.*, p. 37), calling attention to the true meaning of וְכָפַר, "shall be expiated", reads (following Houbigant and Targum) תָּפַר. This reading, he maintains, "is still further confirmed by the parallelism; for תָּפַר, "shall be broken", in the first line, is parallel and synonymous with לֹא תָקִים, "shall not stand", in the second.

(ii) Lowth's commentary abounds in such emendations. For example, in xxx. 26, כָּאוֹר שְׂבָעַת הַיָּמִים "interrupts the rhythmical construction", and so is deleted (following LXX). Most critics have agreed with Lowth.

(iii) In xlvi. 16 Lowth was right in making שֵׁם the verb and not the adverb. His version, "I had decreed it", restores the logical parallelism. This variation from the M.T. is supported by Box.

(iv) Lowth was, apparently, the first to point out that in Isa. l. 10 the LXX Peshiṭta reading, "let him hear", שִׁמַּע should, in the interest of poetic balance, replace the participle of the M.T. שֹׁמֵעַ.

(v) In Isa. lix. 15 Lowth (with no external support) adds וַיִּחַר לוֹ after וַיִּרָא יְהוָה, and so restores the parallelism, not to say the trimeter. This reading is accepted by Marti and Box.

II. (i) As we have seen, Lowth was interested in the question of Hebrew Rhythm. His firm grasp of this helped him to the fearless reconstruction of the Hebrew text. In Isa. xxvi. 4, Lowth omits בְּיָהּ contiguous to יְהוָה, rendering "For in Jehovah is never-failing protection".

(ii) In Isa. xxxiii. 11, for רוּחִי כְמוֹ רוּחַ קֵדָם Lowth reads רוּחִי כְמוֹ [אֵשׁ], thus completing the fourth tetrameter (as well as restoring a true parallelism with the preceding line). The reading is generally accepted today.

(iii) In xlv. 23 Lowth restores the trimeter by reinstating לְאֵלֵהֶם (from LXX), "preserving", as he says, "the elegance of the construction".

(iv) In xlviii. 11, Lowth restores the trimeter by adding (with LXX) שָׁמַיִם after יִתְחַל, "how would *my name* be blasphemed".

(v) In lix. 17 Lowth, with LXX and Vulg. and following Jubb, omits תְּלַבֶּשֶׁת from the third, overloaded, hemistich. So Cheyne (*S.B.O.T.*), p. 159. By an oversight Lowth retains the offending word in his *Translation* ("for his clothing").¹

To return to Lowth himself. He seems to have been professor but three or four years. How many men attended his lectures on Hebrew Poetry and Poetic Form we do not know; nor what they made of the subject so elaborately analyzed by the master. It was twenty-two years before Lowth came back to Oxford—this time as Bishop, holding the office from 1766 to 1777. He was then appointed Bishop of London; and in the year following there appeared *Isaiah: a New Translation with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes*, to which reference has already been made. Only a year passed and the entire volume appeared in German (as had the *Praelectiones*). Lowth's translator this time was Professor J. B. Koppe, also (like Michaëlis) of Göttingen. In 1783 Bishop Lowth was offered, but rejected, the Primacy. He died four years later.

The Commentary is not above criticism. For one thing, some notes are over-long. On the other hand, its merits were still apparent when Condamin wrote his *Isaiah*. Condamin's Commentary contains at least half-a-dozen references to Lowth. One way of assessing the worth of Lowth's *Isaiah* is to look across the North Sea forty-two years after its publication. In the year 1821, Wilhelm Gesenius, Professor at Halle, published in four volumes his *Commentar über den Jesaia*. Apart from a

¹ Without unduly anticipating the discussion of the relationship of Gesenius to Lowth, it may be worth while analyzing here the position of this scholar as regards the above ten emendations (which were in no way specially chosen). (a) Gesenius' *Translation* depends on Lowth for l. 10. (b) Gesenius passes over Lowth on xxvi. 4; xxviii. 18; xxxiii. 11; xlv. 23 and lix. 15. (c) Gesenius rejects Lowth on xxx. 26; xlviii. 11; xlviii. 16 and lix. 17.

new Translation of the Prophet (164 pages), the Introduction and Notes extended to 1600 pages. It would, of course, be going too far to compare Lowth with the Continental scholar who was grammarian, philologist, epigraphist as well as exegete. The centenary of the death of Gesenius the Society for O.T. Study observed by inviting the present-day occupant of his chair to read a paper. Otto Eissfeldt's lecture upon *The Beginnings of Phoenician Epigraphy in the hands of Gesenius* will not easily be forgotten by those who heard it. Upon the relationship of Gesenius to Lowth in the exegetical field the present writer has drawn the following general conclusion. Gesenius took over Lowth's Parallelism; ¹ in his notes Gesenius uses Lowth considerably, at times relying upon him. In accordance with a custom too prevalent, Gesenius only occasionally acknowledges the writer upon whom he depends. On the other hand, when he does refer to Lowth by name, it is usually in order to disagree with him. The significant, and indeed astonishing, point is that when he disagrees with Lowth it can be said generally that the merits of the cases and the subsequent verdict of time both favour Lowth.²

Let us then consider in some detail four passages of Isaiah treated by Lowth and afterwards by Gesenius.³ They illustrate the divergence of outlook of Lowth and Gesenius upon the fundamental problem of O.T. interpretation, viz. the Hebrew text.

(a) In Isa xxi. 8 M.T. has "and a lion called", וְלִיָּוֶהֱ אֶרְיָא; Lowth pronounces this "unintelligible", adding, "the mistake is so obvious that I make no doubt that the true reading is הָרֹאֶה, i.e. "he who sees calls out upon the watchtower".

¹ Though, as far as has been observed, Gesenius does not use the technical term coined by Lowth. Nor has the writer been able to see any mention of Lowth's *Praelectiones* or his *Preliminary Dissertation*. Certainly the thirteen pages of Index do not include a reference to them.

² This view has already received some support from the argument above, pp. 391, 392. A word should be said here with regard to the contention in this paper as to the merits of the textual readings adopted by Lowth and Gesenius in their respective commentaries. It is not, of course, suggested in this thesis that Lowth can always be upheld, nor that Gesenius is always wrong.

³ The passages are not among those the comments upon which by Gesenius were later criticized by Samuel Lee. Lee's criticisms of Gesenius' work dealt chiefly with the use and meaning of Hebrew words. See below, p. 402 and notes.

Gesenius translates "Dann rief er, wie ein Löwe", noting אֲרִיָּה for בְּאַרְיֵה. He claims three examples of such omission of בְּ: (i) Isa. li. 12, which is not parallel; (ii) Isa. lxii. 5 כִּי יִבְעַל כִּי קִיבְעַל, where Lowth reads (not very elegantly) כִּי קִיבְעַל, and Kittel has כִּי-קִבְעַל or כִּי-בְעַל; (iii) Ps. xi. 1 נִוְדִי הָרִים כְּצִפּוֹר—surely an impossible text! (Here the Versions have נִוְדִי הָרִים כְּצִפּוֹר "flee to *the* mountain *like* a sparrow".)¹ And it may be noted that Lowth's reading in the passage cited, הָרָאָה, is that of the Dead Sea Scroll. Isa. A.

(b) In Isa. xlii. 25 M.T. reads "And he poured upon him his fury his anger"—וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ עָלָיו הַמָּה אָפוֹ. Lowth seems to be the first O.T. critic to read the construct הַמָּה.² Gesenius emends as Lowth, "the heat of his anger",³ adding the words, "which some MSS. read". Does it not look as if he so relied on Lowth that he copied him almost mechanically? How otherwise would he come to leave out reference to the support of the Versions here, exactly as Lowth does? Note again that Lowth's emendation in the year 1778 is supported by the Millar Burrows text in 1950.

(c) An instance like the first, where Gesenius disagrees with Lowth, in the passage Isa. liii. 11b,

בְּרַעְתּוֹ יִצְדִּיק יִצְדִּיק עֲבָדִי לְרַבִּים.

"Three MSS. omit יִצְדִּיק; it seems to be only an imperfect repetition, by mistake, of the preceding word. It makes a solecism in this place; for according to the constant usage of the Hebrew language, the adjective, in a phrase of this kind ought to follow the substantive; and יִצְדִּיק עֲבָדִי in Hebrew would be as absurd as 'shall my *servant righteous* justify' in English. Add to this, that it makes the hemistich too long." What is Gesenius' treatment of this textual problem? One is

¹ Gesenius brings forth these three supposed parallels to the reading of M.T., in spite of the note of the Dutch Professor Vitringa, of whose two-volume commentary on Isa. (1714-20) Gesenius in his Preface (pp. 132-4) gives unstinted praise. Vitringa cites Ibn Ezra, and sums up, "Without doubt it seems to me that קִי is deficient".

² Though some Hebrew manuscript authority exists.

³ "die Glut seines Zornes".

faintly reminded of the attitude of certain Rabbis in the Talmud who brush aside an obstruction with the words "there is no difficulty" (לֹא קְשָׁיָא). His text and translation simply repeat M.T., "through his knowledge my righteous servant leads many to righteousness".¹ Without our entering into unnecessary detail in what is a familiar grammatical point, Gesenius' short *Grammatik* (edn. Rödiger, 1845, § 110, 1) declares, "The adjective only very seldom stands before the substantive, namely when an emphasis rests upon it". He concludes his note in his commentary on this point with a reference to his work *Grammatisches Lehrgebäude*.² The commentary note itself, however, maintains that the adjective here precedes its noun for two reasons, (1) because it is emphatic, (2) so as to make it come next to the word of the same root, viz. יִצְדִּיק. Gesenius furnishes just three examples, none of which bears upon this second point.³

¹ Do we not observe an unusual rendering and exegesis of הִצְדִּיק in the notes—"Zur wahren Religion führen"?

² P. 705. Gesenius not seldom refers his readers to this work of 900 pages, *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache mit Vergleichung der verwandten Dialekte* (1817).

³ Further, is not the value of each one of them, even for the first argument—emphasis—to say the least, debatable? Examples: (i) Ps. xcii; 4, ". . . the mighty breakers of the sea (Jehovah on high is mighty)" אֲדִירִים מְשַׁבְּרֵי יָם for which Kittel suggests אֲדִיר מְשַׁבְּרֵי יָם. (ii) Isa. xxiii. 12, הַמְעַשְׂקָה אֲדִירָה Gesenius' translation actually shows "geschändete Jungfrau, Tochter Sidons" instead of "O oppressed one, virgin-daughter of Zidon (or Zion)". (iii) Isa. xxviii. 21

לַעֲשׂוֹת מַעֲשָׂהוּ זָר מַעֲשָׂהוּ וְלַעֲבֹד עֲבָדְתוֹ וְנִכְרִיָּה עֲבָדְתוֹ:

Gesenius, in his own *Commentary* upon this passage, renders the Hebrew accurately, "Strange will be his work"—"befremdend (wird seyn) sein Werk". Not so, however, in the translation-volume of his book. There his interpretation is different, reproducing as it were the E.VV. (from which indeed Lowth had not broken away), "his strange work . . . his strange act"—"ein befremdend Werk . . . ein unerhört Geschäft". In his *Lehrgebäude*, in keeping with this rendering, Gesenius does not give this as an example. And quoting Isa. liii. 11 he adds, as if perhaps he should not cite the passage, that יִצְדִּיק is lacking in some manuscripts.

To resume Lowth's treatment of Isa. liii. 11, יִצְדִּיק יִצְדִּיק עֲבָדִי. It may well be asked who shows himself, in this instance, the better textual critic, poet, grammarian and exegete—Robert Lowth, or he who could suggest in his commentary in all seriousness (p. 192) "יִצְדִּיק might actually have fallen out of some MSS!" We continue the quotation from Gesenius—"which should not have moved Lowth to strike out the word."¹ For it is false that this placing is quite ungrammatical." It would be difficult to find many modern scholars willing to support Gesenius' *Commentary* on this verse; and, as to the contention in his *Grammatik* about putting the adjective first for emphasis, how guarded is the paragraph in the Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley of our time (§ 132 Rem. 1). Was not Lowth right?²

(d) In the verse preceding, Isa. liii. 10, is the well known half-line: אִם תֵּשִׁים אֶשְׁמִי נִפְשִׁי. That the text stands in need of emendation few moderns would deny. יֵשִׁים (3rd sing.) is a *Zohar* reading, supported in our day by Cheyne, Giesebrecht and the 1945 Kittel. Lowth suggested, following Houbigant's³ תֵּשֶׁם (*Hoph'al*, or *Qal* passive), "if his soul shall be made". What does Gesenius say? "יֵשִׁים and Lowth's conjecture תֵּשֶׁם are makeshift expedients".⁴

As regards the making of changes in the Biblical text, Bishop Lowth in his day may have seemed to devout men and to the higher critic Gesenius somewhat as Cheyne, Duhm and Briggs appeared to their contemporaries, and indeed still appear to very many in our generation. Obviously, in such a matter there is scope for divergencies of opinion. Lowth's emendations, however, were seldom based solely on considerations of poetic form or indeed solely upon the early translations, but quite frequently upon variations in Hebrew manuscripts. In this last he was stimulated by his friend Benjamin Kennicott.

¹ "Welches Lowth nicht hätte bewegen sollen, das Wort zu streichen."

² In 1763 the French scholar Houbigant (in his *Biblia Hebraica*) recognized that the M.T. was faulty somewhere. In the clearest language he expressed the view that the Hebrews never place the adjective before the substantive unless the verb "to be" is present, silent or explicit.

³ *Posita fuerit, vel facta (expatiō).*

⁴ "Nothbehelfe der Verlegenheit."

Gesenius in his Introduction to the *Jesaia* describes his general attitude to Lowth. "The notes are in part of an historical and antiquarian kind, in part dogmatic . . . in part critical, where he dares to make numerous emendations in the text, based either on supposed variants in the ancient Versions, or on his own or his friends' (Jubb's and Secker's)¹ conjectures." Let us, however, end this part of the discussion by quoting the very brief but welcome appreciation of Lowth by the great German scholar. In his Introduction he reviews the work of scholars, ancient and modern,² in the Isaiah field; after criticizing Houbigant, he writes: "Robert Lowth is often no less audacious a conjectural critic, but his work on Isaiah has, in aesthetic and poetic insight, outstanding merit. Himself a poet, and the possessor of elegant classical culture, he studied our prophet and, above all, O.T. poetry, from this point of view. Since Grotius this standpoint had once more been totally neglected; but, thanks to Herder, it again became accepted³ in Germany." It is not the set aim of this paper to depreciate Gesenius, whatever the result of the investigation. Rather, one of the greatest Continental Hebraists has been used as a yardstick by which to assess Lowth.

We turn now backwards in time to Johann Herder. We have just seen that Gesenius, eighteen years after Herder's death, said of him that it was mainly he who brought about the appreciation of O.T. poetry in Germany. Herder exercised—at a period which was to some extent one of drought and dry bones—an influence revivifying and uplifting. It is not difficult to bring him into the story of British Interpreters. Upon theological subjects alone Herder wrote a dozen books. The one which Gesenius had specially in his mind, in the quotation in the above paragraph, must be *Vom Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*—

¹ George Jubb (1718-87), Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. His inaugural lecture was entitled *Linguae Hebraicae studium iuventuti academiae commendatum*. Thomas Secker (1693-1758), successively Bishop of Bristol, Oxford, and Archbishop of Canterbury. He was an able Hebraist. Gesenius' reference to these two should not lead us to suppose that their help to Lowth was much more than occasional. Jubb is not, of course, to be confused with John Jebb, whose *Essay on Sacred Literature* (1820) deals with Lowth's work.

² P. 135. Cf. also p. 139.

³ "einheimisch wurde".

the first edition of which (in 760 pages) appeared in the year 1782. What is important for our assessment of Robert Lowth is that twenty-nine years before this date the Latin *Praelectiones* had been published, followed by all that Michaëlis had done to interest his compatriots in Lowth's work upon Hebrew poetry. Koppe's translation, moreover, of the entire *Isaiah* volume for three years had been available in Germany. Apart from these possibilities of indebtedness on the part of Herder, an examination of his *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* shows beyond all doubt that in this matter it was to the Englishman that he owed his inspiration, although Herder does not appear to mention Lowth. Early in *Vom Geist* (p. 18) we come across the technical term "parallelism" which was actually coined by Lowth. In a dialogue between an imaginary opponent and the writer, the former exclaims, "So you come to the much-praised (gepriesenen) parallelism, where I would hardly be of your opinion". In this book Herder extols the beauties of parallelism, and he sets forth a considerable variety of Biblical poetry in such a way as to display the phenomenon. If Johann Herder had the honour of introducing the appreciation of Hebrew poetry to his own countrymen, it was Lowth who introduced it to Herder.

Without being ultra-nationalistic, surely we can hold our heads high with regard to Lowth as eighteenth century critic and interpreter of the O.T. When, however, we come to the question of the application of the O.T. to the needs of the living generation, we shall probably say that he is rather disappointing. True, in his *Commentary* he is definitely interested in the prophetic theme of righteousness *versus* mere sacrifice. Of his sermons ten were published during his life-time and eight after. It seems likely that we can consider these eighteen as fair samples. Only one-third is based upon a text from the O.T., e.g. "Be not rash with thy mouth", and "There is no peace . . . to the wicked". Well-written as are the Bishop's discourses, his use of the O.T. does not make our heart glow within us. We are somewhat surprised that the enthusiasm for the O.T. which is manifest in his *Translation* of *Isaiah* into English is not matched by an enthusiasm on

his part to see the goodness of it translated into human life.¹ Our thoughts turn in contrast to such volumes in our generation as those of the late Professor S. R. Driver's *Sermons on the O.T.* (1892), with its introductory paper upon the *Permanent Moral and Devotional Value of the O.T.*, and the late Professor R. H. Kennett's *In Our Tongues* (1907). Possibly this criticism is somewhat unjust to Lowth. He does certainly dwell, too much indeed, upon the Deuteronomic theme of goodness bringing reward.

We now turn to Samuel Lee, who was born in 1783 and died in 1852. It is to be regretted that no colleague wrote a biography of him. As it is, there is only the quite useful, but rather brief, memoir, published in 1896. It was a labour of love on the part of a daughter by his second wife, and it bears the title *A Scholar of a Past Generation*. Samuel Lee was of humble origin. In 1814 he became, at the age of thirty, a member of Queens' College, Cambridge. In Lee's first year Claudius Buchanan (D.D. of Cambridge and Glasgow), who might be termed a practical orientalist, died, leaving a Syriac New Testament unfinished. This Samuel Lee, whilst himself still an undergraduate, completed, collating manuscripts for the purpose, and seeing the edition through the press. Hardly had he taken his degree, when he published his translations of parts of the Bible into Arabic, Coptic, and Persian. Lowth knew Hebrew, Targumic Aramaic and the *Peshitta*, but Samuel Lee was said to be master of eighteen languages. In 1819 he was appointed Professor of Arabic at Cambridge. In 1822, that is eleven years before receiving a Cambridge doctorate, he was given the D.D. of Halle at the hands of Gesenius himself. During the dozen years in which he was Arabic professor he published the Syriac O.T., improving little indeed upon Walton's *Polyglot*.² It was, however, a fine quarto volume which served its generation and, even after 130 years, is not out of date

¹ The *Introductory Memoir* describes him as "engrossed in the pursuits of theological literature, and the excitement of polemical rivalry" (p. 38).

² Though he made some corrections, and he is said to have used some readings from the Jacobite MS. from Travancore, given by Buchanan to Cambridge University Library in 1809 (Syr. MS. Oo, l. 1, 2), the "Buchanan Bible".

except in respect of the Pentateuch (which was revised in 1914 by Barnes, Mitchell and Pinkerton). Four years later appeared Lee's *Grammar of the Hebrew Language* (400 pages). Then it occurred to him to produce something connected with his professorship, viz. *The Travels of Ibn Batūta*, translated from the Arabic, with notes (1829).¹ The second period of his academic life began in 1831, when he was made Regius Professor of Hebrew, a chair which he held for seventeen years. During this professorship he became a member of Trinity College,² publishing (among other works) his Hebrew *Lexicon*³ and the *Theophania* of Eusebius in Syriac and in English. His home, thirteen miles outside Cambridge, was at Barley in Hertfordshire, of which village he was Rector from 1838 until he died in 1851. His professorship terminated three years before his death. In the first year of his retirement his volume on prophecy came out.

So much by way of framework. Four points may now be put forward concerning Lee as an O.T. Interpreter: I. Commentary; II. Prophecy and its interpretation; III. Criticism of Gesenius; and IV. Lee's abiding significance.

I. Like Lowth and Gesenius, Lee wrote only one commentary. This appeared in 1837 under the title *The Book of the Patriarch Job: translated from the original Hebrew with Introduction and a Commentary, Critical and Exegetical* (553 octavo pages). Of his notes it might be said that they are not a very complete set; but they are not lacking in depth. Like Gesenius he values the researches of Ernst Rosemüller (1768-1835), but he was not altogether happy about him. Although both were scholars of Arabic, Lee was no longer professing the subject; but an examination of the volume suggests the question, Has a commentary on an O.T. book ever contained so many Arabic references and citations, by way of explaining Hebrew expressions and ideas?

¹ Ibn Batūta, in the fourteenth century, travelled during twenty years from Spain to Greece, China, Delhi and the Maldivé Islands.

² From 1838-48 his rooms were in the Great Court. According to information received, they were E 2, then, in 1839-48, R 5, and finally, in 1848, in Nevile's Court, I 1.

³ The conclusion of this excellent dictionary, over which he took immense pains, was compiled by his successor in the chair of Arabic.

II. The Cambridge Professor was interested, as we should expect, in prophecy. In 1849 he published the volume mentioned above, of 509 pages, *An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress and End of Prophecy*. It contains no reference to the prophets Amos or Micah, nor to the characteristic teaching, as we hold it to be, of all the great prophets of Israel. Book I is on "The Covenants". Book II is "An Exposition of the Visions of Daniel ¹ as far as they relate to the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth"; and Book III concerns The Revelation. There are two further points about Lee which call for comment. The first is that a man with copious oriental learning at his command should in this book hold down exegesis by so close a dependence on the N.T. and the Fathers. Secondly, he makes no effort to discriminate within the O.T. between either the very varying degrees of permanent religious "truth" or the value for practical living and conduct. There is one achievement vastly to Lee's credit in the matter of applying the O.T., viz. that he refuted the position of Joseph Mede (1586-1638) Fellow of Christ's College, who for two hundred years in British Protestant circles had dominated the apocalyptic field. Lee declared "Every one of these [Mede's] notions is groundless, and unworthy of regard".²

III. Lee wrote no commentary on Isaiah. He published, however, even before he took up his Hebrew professorship, *Two Dissertations*, bound up with his *Six Sermons on the Study of Holy Scriptures . . . preached before the University of Cambridge*. *Dissertation I*, part ii, §§ iv-vi, contains fifty octavo pages of criticism of points and of principles of Gesenius' *Commentary*. In his analyses (with much that does not hold)

¹ Cf. his last, and perhaps his least, work, *The Events and Times of the Visions of Daniel and St. John investigated* (1851).

² Lee, *On Prophecy*, p. xxviii. Even so, not everyone has been convinced. In 1898 the "Median" position was set forth by Joseph Tanner of Magdalen College, Oxford, in *Daniel and the Revelation* (540 octavo pages). In 1949 a 550-page *Commentary on Daniel* by H. C. Leupold, of Columbus, Ohio, still explains the "Little Horn" as being the Pope! The references in Mede are *The Apostasy of the Latter Times* (1642), pp. 46 ff. (on Dan. vii. 25, etc.), and pp. 93 ff. (on Dan. xi. 36-9).

Lee is not seldom right.¹ Moreover, precisely how much do the Aramaisms, collected in Gesenius' Introduction to Isa. xl-lxvi, and his arguments thereon, amount to today? Lee, who is against the dual authorship of Isaiah, gives instances of Aramaising verb-forms and the so-called Aramaic pointing of אָתָם for אֹתָם as being by no means always characteristic of later writers.² On the uses and meanings of Hebrew words Lee is at times more correct than Gesenius. Often, however, Lee's criticisms of Gesenius arise from what might be described as an over-anxiety on his part to preserve traditional ideas of the fulfilment of prophecy.³ In regard to his criticisms he makes it clear that it is a sense of duty that impels him. It is this that causes Lee to argue against a "rationalistic" tendency in the work of him to whom he had been indebted (eight years previously) at Halle "for the highest distinction his [Gesenius'] University could bestow upon" him.⁴

IV. His judgement was not always right in matters of detail, nor with regard to the new trend of O.T. research dating from about the time of Lowth and Astruc. He had no use for the textual emendations of Lowth. That there was poetry in the O.T. he, of course, recognized; but, when he writes of Lowth's poetic principles, he declares, "Parallelism is no great proof of poetry."⁵ After all, Lee was a Professor of Arabic and of

¹ E.g. Gesenius on Isa. liii. 8, declares that לְמֹי here is plural (referring to the Servant as "collective"). Lee said it was singular. So does Gesenius-Buhl, which cites also Isa. xlv. 15.

² Gesenius *Isa.*, Pt. ii, pp. 24, 25; Lee, *Sermons and Dissertations*, I, § v., p. 189 (Isa. lix. 21, cf. xlv. 15). Lee will not agree that in lxi. 10 בְּהֵן has the sense of the Syriac כָּבֵד, "to be splendid". Certainly Gesenius is not upheld today; Box (with others) emends to יְבִין, "orders", or "appoints". The reference is Lee, p. 185.

³ The feeling that not a little of Lee's writing was (in spite of himself) tendentious, at first prejudiced the writer of this paper against it. It was only after a study of Gesenius' attitude towards Lowth that he began to take Lee's criticisms seriously and so came to appreciate better his merit.

⁴ Lee's *Sermons and Dissertations*, p. xxviii.

⁵ *Commentary on Job*, pp. 106, 107. He said that he could never read in public from a version of the O.T. exhibiting parallelism! Not a little, however, of his comments in these pages upon Lowth's poetic theory has gained acceptance. Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 38, reminds us that "parallelism actually occurs in prose". See also Gray's penetrating remarks, pp. 39-52.

Hebrew, and we must put ourselves in his place when we observe how he handles the Semitic work of one who was a *Poetry* professor and an ecclesiastic! It may be affirmed that he was not simply fighting, in respect of the O.T., a rearguard action. He was subjecting to minute examination the writings of men of his own and other generations.¹ Coming nearer our own time, were it not for similar critical work by scholars—and others—during the last seventy years, might not today every one be found bowing down to the *Prolegomena* of Wellhausen in its entirety as to a golden image of infallible and eternal truth?

In the matter of constructive contribution to Biblical scholarship, it is Lowth rather who claims our interest. He was an able interpreter of the O.T. Over against him is Lee. Although in this role we cannot class him as high as Lowth, it could be argued that in a vital sense he stands *above* him. In his work generally, and not in his University sermons only, we meet a man who is possessed of a reverence for the Bible. Within both Testaments he sees a revelation of God and His will, and for Lee's nation and for Lee's day. "The Bible", he declares,² "must not inform the mind in a theoretical or speculative way. If then the mind is to be informed and enlightened it is that it may be raised, humbled, encouraged . . .". In such words do we not see Lee as the O.T. scholar who desires that the Bible may be applied to human life, and may perform its own work, that God may have His way in His world? World, indeed, for in *The Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles*³ there are, under the name of Samuel Lee, no fewer than seventeen foreign entries. He strove that the Bible should be known in the vernacular from Arabia to Persia, from India to Malay.

¹ Lee's endeavour was to be a literalist. "I feel bound", he said in his note on Job xix. 27, "to follow the text, not to wrest and force it to follow me. . . . It is the duty of an interpreter . . . carefully to follow the easiest sense which his author will afford. . . ."

² Cf. *Cambridge Sermons*, II, p. lviii, "The mind [the Bible] must inform . . . to urge with great earnestness and force the necessity of faith, obedience, humility, forbearance, charity".

³ Published by the B. & F.B.S. Several of these entries refer to translations of parts of the Bible, which later were incorporated into larger works.

Let us hope that the Old Testament will be applied more and more (with a better exegesis than was possible to Lee) to the needs of today by the scholars of our generation. Theoretical research—archaeological, exegetical—important as it is, does not make the Bible “come alive”¹ to people. The Bible is truly alive, but must not men and women be shown this? It comes *from* God, it is life-giving, and it should lead men to God,² even as it says “Seek the LORD and ye shall live”.

¹ Cf. the title of Sir Charles Marston's book upon the Lachish Letters, *The Bible Comes Alive*.

² Cf. Prof. Porteous, upon a subject not unrelated to that under review, at the Dutch O.T. Society Conference at Leiden, *Semantics and O.T. Theology*: “The supreme business of the Biblical theologian is to ensure that the Bible should be seen, not as man's witness to himself, but as his witness to God.” (*Oudtestamentische Studiën*, 1950.)

BATE'S CASE AND "LANE'S" REPORTS: THE AUTHENTICITY OF A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY LEGAL TEXT

By G. D. G. HALL, M.A.,

FELLOW AND LECTURER IN LAW OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

IN 1657 William Lee, Gabriell Bedell and Daniell Pakeman published in Fleet Street, London, a volume of Exchequer Reports said to be by the late Sir Richard Lane.¹ The full title of the work was "Reports in the Court of Exchequer, Beginning in the third, and ending in the ninth year of the Raign of the late King James. By the Honourable Richard Lane, Late of the Middle Temple, an eminent Professor of the Law, sometime Attorney Generall to the late Prince Charles, Being the first Collections in that Court hitherto extant". The reports take up 119 pages in a slim folio volume, and are preceded and followed respectively by "two exact Alphabeticall Tables, the one of the names of the Cases, the other of the Principall Matters contained in this Booke". In obedience to a Cromwellian Act of 1649 the cases had been translated from Law French into English.² Unlike most of the contemporary legal publications of this Fleet Street trio, "Lane's" Reports have no Preface or Introduction of any kind.³

Not only the trio, but many other men were publishing law reports in the middle of the seventeenth century, volumes often

¹ There was a reprint at Dublin in 1884 by C. F. Morrell, with notes and a biography of Lane. The notes are elementary and the life is based on unacknowledged quotations from standard judicial biographies.

² The Act took effect from 1 January 1650; see J. W. Wallace, *The Reporters*, 4th edn. (Philadelphia, 1882), p. 20 and P. H. Winfield, *The Chief Sources of English Legal History* (Harvard, 1925), p. 10.

³ Some information about the three men is given in H. R. Plomer, *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907). They began to collaborate as law publishers in 1648. Between 1657 and 1659 the trio published together the following reports: Bulstrode (3 parts; 1657, 1658, 1659), Winch (1657), "Lane" (1657), Style's *Modern Reports* (1658). All but "Lane" have expansive prefatory remarks.

of uncertain parentage and value.¹ "Lane's" Reports probably made no stir at the time, and have been seldom cited since. In fact, they might have been wholly forgotten had it not been for one case. That case is the *Case of Impositions or Bate's Case*, decided in the Exchequer in 1606. It is printed in this volume of reports at pages 22-31.² The purpose of this article is to suggest that there is no real ground for attributing the reports to Lane, and also to contend that, whoever was the author of the reports, he never reported *Bate's Case* which was introduced into the volume either by a collector whose manuscript the publishers used, or more probably by the publishers themselves in furtherance of a plan to improve the sales of the book.

Now the detection of such a false ascription is interesting in itself whatever the subject-matter of the imposture, but it gains in interest when the subject-matter is a famous law case, and even more so when the imposture is the evidence on which historians have universally relied when discussing the case. It may be well, therefore, at the outset, to recall the facts which led up to the decision in *Bate's Case*, and also the importance of the case in the seventeenth century constitutional struggle.³

In 1575 a patent was granted to Acerbo Velutelli giving him the sole right to import currants and oil from Venetian territories. Velutelli threw open the trade to others, both English and foreign, on payment of fines for licence to trade. A Venetian counter-attack led to an appeal to Elizabeth, who put a corresponding impost of 5s. 6d. per cwt. on currants landed in England from foreign ships. In 1583 Velutelli's patent was cancelled; he was succeeded until 1589 by the Venetian Company: eventually a Joint Company was incorporated in 1592 as the Levant Company, with a twelve-year monopoly of trade to Venice and Turkey. The Levant Company, like the Venetian Company before 1589 and Velutelli before 1583, raised revenue

¹ On this see generally Wallace, *op. cit.* pp. 1-38; C. K. Allen, *Law in the Making*, 5th edn. (Oxford, 1951), pp. 217-24.

² Reprinted in *State Trials*, ed. Howell, ii. 382-94.

³ The next two paragraphs are based on S. R. Gardiner, *History of England 1603-1642*, 3rd edn. (London, 1889), ii. 1-5; A. C. Wood, *A History of the Levant Company* (Oxford, 1935), ch. ii.; F. C. Dietz, *English Public Finance 1558-1641* (London, 1932), *passim*, especially pp. 365-6.

by permitting the import of currants by non-members on payment of 5s. 6d. per cwt. The Crown spotted this imposition in 1599, decided to levy the tax for itself, and demanded it in May 1600. It was refused, and Elizabeth cancelled the charter of the Levant Company on a technical pretext. After some manoeuvre the Company received a new charter in December 1600 which provided in effect that, in return for a payment of £4,000 a year to the Exchequer, the Company should farm the impost on currants. For the next two years the £4,000 was paid and the Company took 10s. a cwt. on currants from non-members. Then in May 1603 the Company lost its charter at a time when it owed £2,000, half the yearly rent of the farm.¹ Not until December 1605 did the Company get a new charter; the interval was devoted to a complicated struggle between the Crown, Levant merchants, English and Venetian merchants not members of the Company, and the Lord Chamberlain Suffolk. The first reaction of the Crown in 1603 was to regain the lost £4,000 a year by imposition, and in October the Lord Treasurer was directed to re-impose the former duties. An elaborate pantomime followed in which the Levant merchants cried poverty and gave bonds not cash for the impositions, and in which James affected a complete lack of interest in the state of affairs at Constantinople. In November 1604 the custom, subsidy and imposition on currants were farmed to Roger Dallison and Richard Wright for ten years at £5,322 a year—this was the Suffolk interest. In the middle of 1605 the Venetian State Papers indicate a change of attitude by the Crown, seemingly disturbed by the evidences of poor trade and unpaid representatives in the Levant, and in December letters patent established the Company on a new footing which maintained and enlarged its sphere of operation; the Company was to be open to all who subscribed a fixed sum, the Crown was to levy the imposition by

¹ This has been variously represented by writers as the result of poor trading conditions, or of a desire to conform to proclamations against monopolies, or as a crafty move to get better terms from James than from Elizabeth. The proceedings by the Crown twelve years later to recover the £2,000 make it quite plain that the Company could have paid but preferred not to, and took advantage of the consequent automatic forfeiture provided for in the letters patent of 1600 (Lincoln's Inn, Hale MS. lxxviii (lxxxiii), fols. 52^r-55^r).

its farmers, and the Company was to get from the Crown a present of £5,322, the first year's farm, with which to pacify the Sultan. Then in 1606 James began to demand payment on the spot.

On 2 April John Bate, a member of the Company, landed currants at London, paid the statutory poundage and refused to pay the imposition. On 11 April he was committed to the Marshalsea. Meanwhile the Commons were debating the Grievances to be exhibited to the King, and on 11 April counsel were heard for both merchants and farmers.¹ When the Grievances were delivered to the whole House, the imposition on currants was no. 5; this was on 10 May.² On 27 May the King prorogued Parliament, having decided to allow *Bate's Case* to be resolved in the Exchequer Court. During the week 30 June-5 July counsel on both sides argued the case in the Exchequer; Topham and Davenport for Bate, Bacon and, perhaps, Doddridge for the King. The following Monday, 7 July, argument was concluded, and on the same day Dorset wrote to Salisbury that the Barons were for the King but thought it better to delay judgement until the next term, that they might have time to prepare reasoned statements—the Exchequer Trinity Term was due to end in two days. The following term Snigg and Savill declared for the Crown on Saturday, 8 November; on 10 November Clarke and Chief Baron Fleming did the same.³ With this result the King was able to answer the Grievance about currants in a reply read to the Commons on 19 November.⁴ For the time being the question of impositions was dropped.

The case does not seem to have excited quite as much contemporary interest as the attention paid to it nowadays would lead one to expect. Currants were only one of many commodities carrying an imposition, and *Bate's Case* one of a line of cases from 1554 onwards about the legality of imposts.⁵ Moreover, it was decided at a time when the binding force of judicial

¹ *The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer 1606-1607*, ed. D. H. Willson (Minnesota, 1931), pp. 105, 109, 117 ff.

² *Ibid.* p. 153.

³ A fuller account of this chronology, with details of the manuscript reports on which it is based, is given in my article on "Impositions and the Courts, 1554-1606", which will appear in the *Law Quarterly Review*.

⁴ *Commons Journals*, i. 317.

⁵ See n. 3, *supra*.

precedent was as yet unknown; it was reported in manuscript but not printed for fifty years; and it was overshadowed by later events and in particular by the issue of a new Book of Rates in 1608, "which alarmed public opinion as the decision in *Bate's Case* failed to do",¹ and by the great Debate on Impositions in 1610. To a later age, however, the case stood out as one of the earliest clashes between Crown and Common Law in the constitutional struggle which was to ruin the Stuarts. Hallam, who saw the matter in terms of white right and black wrong, regarded the tax as indefensible, the decision as evidence of corruption and subservience.² He was corrected in detail by Hubert Hall,³ who in his turn had to suffer the savagery of John Horace Round.⁴ Modern tendencies to specialization have meant that discussion of the case is now often from a particular angle, that of the constitutional historian, the lawyer, the political scientist. So that, from one point of view, the case illustrates "the old distinction between *jurisdictio* and *gubernaculum*", between those who "were relying exclusively on the precedents of the ancient *jurisdictio*" and those who "with equal justice could cite innumerable instances of royal acts of government beyond or even against the common law".⁵ On the other hand, lawyers, admitting the complexity of the affair but preferring to stick to the legal point, have said that "the gist of the decision was that the King might impose what duties he pleased if it was only for the purpose of regulating trade and not of raising revenue, and the Court could not go behind the King's statement that the duty was in fact imposed for the regulation of trade".⁶ To

¹ D. L. Keir and F. H. Lawson, *Cases in Constitutional Law*, 3rd edn. revised (Oxford, 1948), p. 37, n. 1.

² The judges were "some corrupt with hope of promotion, many more fearful of removal, or awestruck by frown of power" (*Constitutional History of England* (London, 1810), p. 229).

³ Hubert Hall, *A History of the Custom-Revenue in England*, i (London, 1885), 124-39.

⁴ The unfriendly correspondence between Hall and Round on this subject is in *The Antiquary*, vols. vi and vii *passim*.

⁵ C. H. McIlwain, *Constitutionalism: Ancient and Modern* (New York, 1947), p. 129.

⁶ Keir and Lawson, *op. cit.* p. 37. It was a point of great importance in *Bate's Case* whether James imposed for revenue or to control trade. The facts,

others the speech of Chief Baron Fleming, in which he distinguished between the absolute and ordinary power of the King, has been the basis for discussion as to the nature of royalist pretensions, "a first halting step toward the formulation of a theory of 'absolute' prerogative such as would cover and justify almost all the positive claims made and disputed down to 1640".¹ Whatever the approach, however, these accounts have one thing in common. They all depend on the report of *Bate's Case* printed in "Lane's" Reports. The universal acceptance of such a report, which, unlike an official entry on the plea rolls, carries no authority beyond that of its maker, seems to imply two beliefs; first, that this is the only available report of the case, and second, that it is a report from a respectable source. The first belief is certainly wrong, for at least six versions of the case exist in manuscript, and these I have detailed elsewhere.² The second belief is probably wrong, and to prove it so is the purpose of this article. The arguments for this contention are not conclusive; there will be no production of an autograph manuscript with collector's or publishers' amendments or additions. But the evidence does seem to point indirectly to these conclusions which, if correct, throw interesting new light on a trade already known to have few scruples. This evidence comes from the life of Sir Richard Lane, from the printed book itself, from the Registers of the Stationers' Company, and from the extant manuscripts of "Lane's" Reports, which are numerous.

The list of manuscripts which follows is almost certainly incomplete. It covers only the Bodleian Library at Oxford, the University Library at Cambridge, the college libraries of these two universities, the British Museum and the Inns of

as distinct from legal presumptions, are these: the Elizabethan Company had forfeited its charter when the first £2,000 was due to James; in November 1604, when it was discovered that no bonds for impositions had been met, the Crown remitted all arrears, about £6,000; from then to the beginning of 1606 the only possible revenue was the first year's farm of £5,322, and that was given to the new Company. In short, until early in 1606 James had not a penny from the impost on currants.

¹ J. W. Allen, *English Political Thought 1603-1660*, i (London, 1938), 8.

² See p. 408, n. 3, *supra*.

Court. Yet it might, on the other hand, be criticized as excessive because, for the purpose of this article, "extant manuscripts of 'Lane's' Reports" means all collections of cases in which appear cases also found in the printed book of 1657.¹ There are nine such manuscripts, and they can be divided into three groups, but this division is based solely on the present content of the manuscripts, and implies nothing at all as to provenance or kinship with one another. All of them are copies, some earlier than others, but certainly none later than the end of the seventeenth century. Five of them (Ha, Hy, Ca, L, Hb) are wholly or in part in the same hand, which suggests that they may be the product of one copying agency in the early part of the century. It is unlikely that any of them was, or can have been, used by the publishers in 1657, but it will be easier to explain this statement after giving the list of manuscripts.

Group I is represented by six manuscripts, Ha, Hy, L, Ca, Cb and A. The cases in these manuscripts are those in the printed volume, save that the manuscripts lack *Wickham v. Wood* ("Lane", p. 113), *Beckett's Case* ("Lane", p. 118) and the final note on feoffment to uses ("Lane", p. 119); they have, on the other hand, about forty cases distributed throughout the series which are not in the printed book. The manuscripts in the group are:

Ha = British Museum, Hargrave MS. 33, fols 5^r-76^v: formerly in the possession of E. Umfreville whose Index refers to it as "Repts. in Scaccario etc. tempore Jacobi primi". It later belonged to Francis Hargrave, who added, "Lane, many of which not printed"; Hargrave was, however, referring to the cases at fols. 77^r-94^r which are in a different hand and have no evident connection with the earlier set of cases.

Hy = British Museum, Harleian MS. 4814, fols. 218^r-264^r. Some of the cases found in Ha are missing. It is not ascribed internally or in the catalogue to Lane.

L = Longleat (Marquis of Bath) MS. 244. The reports cover 70 folios, but the foliation of the book stops at fol. 53. The contents are exactly as in Ha. It is not ascribed internally or in the catalogue to Lane.

¹ Even so I have excluded Lincoln's Inn, Maynard MS. 2, which contains many of the cases in "Lane", often in abbreviated versions, the order of cases differing from that of any other manuscript and some of the cases being repeated as many as three times. In no way, however, do the contents differ from those of the other manuscripts in a manner material to this article.

- Ca = Cambridge University Library MS. Gg II-23, fols. 17^r-25^v (A) and 157^r-219^v (B). This volume illustrates the common desire of collectors of law reports to have a chronological run (in this case from Mich. 2 Jac. to Mich. 11 Jac.), even at the expense of dismembering an extant set of reports. A and B were clearly together at one time. They are in the same hand; the original (and still surviving) foliation of A is 1-8 and of B 9-72; fol. 8^v of this old foliation carries a catchword found on fol. 9^r (now fols. 25^v and 157^r); the folios are pierced in a way not found elsewhere in the volume. They were separated to allow the chronological insertion of cases in 4 and 5 Jac. Moreover, A is preceded by 17 folios of cases in 2 Jac. The content of Ca is exactly as in Ha. It is not ascribed internally or in the catalogue to Lane.
- A = British Museum, Add. MS. 35955, fols. 99^v-147^r. The whole manuscript is a volume of miscellaneous reports. On fol. 99^v *Bret. v. Johnson* begins in the form common to all the manuscripts. At the top of fol. 100^r the report stops abruptly, and there is a reference to reports of the first two stages of this case earlier in the same volume (at fols. 65^v and 69^r; see *infra*, p. 423). Then "Lane's" Reports continue with the *Mayor of Lincoln's Case*, and at fol. 102^r comes the third stage of *Bret. v. Johnson* as found in "Lane" (*infra*, p. 424) but minus Serjeant Nichols' speech, and somewhat abbreviated. The cases from "Lane" stop after *Calvert v. Kitchin* (Ha fol. 70^r; "Lane", p. 104). Several of the cases are abbreviated, and a few found in Ha are missing. The reports are not ascribed internally or in the catalogue to Lane.

Group II is represented by two manuscripts only, La and Lb. Each contains about twenty cases, none of them found in Group I. They are mostly from the Exchequer, but only two (*Wickham v. Wood* and *Beckett's Case*) are in the printed book. Even these are reported in the manuscript at greater length than in the 1657 work and only with considerable and imaginative efforts in translation and re-ordering can the publishers have produced the printed reports of these two cases from these versions. They are included here, however, because this set of twenty cases appears again in Group III, and because several of the cases bear the same name as cases reported in Group I and the printed book, but seem to be later stages of those cases. The manuscripts are:

- La = British Museum, Lansdowne MS. 1172, fols. 201^r-295^r. Written in a large hand, probably of the late seventeenth century. It later belonged to E. Umfreville, who labelled it as "part of Lane's Reports", but made the mistake of putting page references to the printed book against the reports of those later stages noted above. It is catalogued as part of Lane's Reports.

Lb = British Museum, Lansdowne MS. 1098, fols. 30^r-107^v. The content is the same as La, in a hand of about the same time. It is not ascribed internally or in the catalogue to Lane.

Group III is represented only by Hb (fols. 1^r-110^v), which is a composite of Groups I and II, consisting of Group I with Group II interpolated at fols 83^r-110^r. In addition, however, to the cases already noted in Group II (including *Wickham v. Wood* and *Beckett's Case*) there are three others, one from the Chancery and two from the Exchequer.

Hb = British Museum, Hargrave MS. 16, fols. 3^r-111^r. The manuscript belonged to Sir Henry Calthorpe, in whose execrable handwriting are the running titles at the top of the pages and the marginal notes. It later belonged to Francis Hargrave, who labelled it "Sir Henry Calthorpe's Copy of Lane's Reports". To fol. 83^r the content is as in Ha, then follow the cases from La and Lb with the three additions, and at fol. 110^r the order reverts to Ha again. At fol. 83^r the handwriting becomes that which is found in four other of the manuscripts and this hand continues to the end of Hb.

The difficulty in saying that any of these nine manuscripts was, or could have been, used by the publishers is that Hb alone contains enough cases, but even it lacks the note on feoffment to uses ("Lane", p. 119) and has *Wickham v. Wood* and *Beckett's Case* in a different form. The versions in "Lane" and in Hb may have a common origin but those in "Lane" can hardly be taken from Hb. The handwriting common to five of the manuscripts¹ may lead to conjecture, but has suggested no obvious solution, save that the present confused state of the manuscripts may in part result from the vagaries of a professional copyist. It is possible that the original "Lane's" Reports is represented by Group I, that Group II is the work of another man (or perhaps the later work of the same man, since later stages of the same cases appear), and that Group III is a composite work. To conjecture further would require a greater degree of collation than has been attempted, and a greater measure of trust in the results to be obtained from such collations. The difficulty is not, in any case, material to the contentions that follow, though its solution would add to our knowledge of publishers' methods with law reports.

¹ It occurs as follows: Ha—all; Hy—fol. 224^v to end; Ca—all; L—fol. 52^r to end; Hb—fol. 83^r to end.

Though the main contention in this article concerns *Bate's Case*, there is first to be considered the suggestion that Lane was perhaps not the author of any of the reports in the printed book. There is an account of Lane's life in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, but a fuller statement of his legal career will help to show that he is not likely to have written the reports.

Richard Lane was born at Harpole in Northamptonshire in 1584. His father has, without evidence, been variously described as "yeoman"¹ and "poor though of good family".² The son went to Westminster School and thence, perhaps, to Cambridge, but he certainly never graduated.³ In 1605 he became a student of the Middle Temple in London. His progress in the Inn is clearly marked in the Parliament Books to the day in February 1613 when he had satisfied the new regulations designed to arrest the educational decline of the Inns, and was confirmed and sworn as Utter Barrister.⁴

For a space of fourteen years the entries relating to Lane in the Parliament Book are confined to penalties for absence from Readings, and notes that he is surety for a newly admitted

¹ *Northampton Borough Records*, ed. J. C. Cox, ii (Northampton, 1898), 106.

² R. M. Sergeantson, *History of the Church of St. Peter, Northampton* (Northampton, 1904), p. 180. In 1602 Richard Lane, senior, was assessed for subsidy on his goods at £5 13s. 4d. (*Northants Record Society*, ed. J. Wake, iii. 96). It is not safe to attempt absolute conclusions from such figures, but comparison with other figures gives these results: in the 10 hundreds of the West Division of Northamptonshire 365 were assessed on goods at less than Lane, 15 at the same amount, 19 at a higher amount. In his own hundred of Wymersley these figures are 56, 1, 2. This takes no account of assessments on land, paid usually by a small and prosperous minority.

³ According to J. Welch, *Alumni Westmonasteriensis* (London, 1852), p. 70, Lane went from Westminster to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1602. There is no mention of him in the volume of *Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge, 1546-1700*, ed. W. W. Rouse Ball and J. A. Venn (Cambridge, 1913), but the information for this period is based on University not College sources. In any event Lane never graduated (*The book of matriculations and degrees at Cambridge, 1554-1659*, ed. J. and J. A. Venn (Cambridge, 1913)). According to G. F. R. Barker and A. H. Stenning, *The Record of Old Westminsters*, ii (London, 1928), 553, he was "elected head to Trinity College Cambridge 1602 but was never admitted".

⁴ Middle Temple Records, *Minutes of Parliament*, ed. A. R. Ingpen, ii. (London, 1904), especially at pp. 452, 472, 493, 542, 548, 560. The new regulations are given *ibid.* ii. 540-1.

student. Then on 9 February 1627 Lane was appointed with three others to provide the Lent Reader's Feast, a customary prelude to advancement.¹ The following February he was chosen with three others to stand at the Cupboard.² Those who stood at the Cupboard argued in turn the Reader's case; four times at the Cupboard were normally followed by election as next Reader. Sir Robert Brerewood, whose account of the Middle Temple Dugdale transcribed without acknowledgement, noted that "no man ought to take upon him to be a Cupboard man unless he Resolveth to read when his turn cometh; . . . yet time alone makes not a Cupboard man".³ It is not easy to discover what had made Lane a Cupboard man; certainly time alone seems to have made him a Reader, for on the first three of the four occasions on which he was chosen to stand at the Cupboard he paid £5 fine for not being at the Cupboard.⁴ On the fourth occasion, the Autumn Reading of 1629, there is no record of a fine and in October he was chosen next Lent Reader.⁵ According to Dugdale he did not read ("electus; sed non legebat causa pestilentiae, fol. 50a"), but this reference to the manuscript Parliament Book of the Middle Temple is to the Autumn Reading following Lane's.⁶ Lane did, in fact, read in Lent, and in a manuscript volume of Readings in the Hargrave Collection there is a brief version of "Mr. Lane's Lecture Quadrages 1629 [i.e. 1630], sur lestatut de 21 H 8 cap 13 de Non Residence".⁷ Lane continued his progress; in 1636 he moved into the chamber of Sergeant Malet, a Bencher's chamber; in January 1637 he and Sir Henry Calthorpe were appointed to discuss with certain Benchers of the Inner Temple an amicable settlement of the controversy between the two houses; in

¹ *Minutes of Parliament*, ii. 716.

² *Ibid.* ii. 729.

³ W. Dugdale, *Origines Judiciales*, 2nd edn. (London, 1671), p. 203. Dugdale's debt to Brerewood is discussed by A. R. Ingpen, editor of the *Middle Temple Bench Book* (London, 1912), at pp. ix-xi.

⁴ *Minutes of Parliament*, ii. 731, 738, 745.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii. 752, 757.

⁶ *Origines Judiciales*, p. 220. I am indebted to the Librarian of the Middle Temple for permission to confirm Dugdale's error from the manuscript Register of the Society.

⁷ British Museum, Hargrave MS. 91, fols. 338^r-347^v. It is a brief account in a style suggesting notes taken at the time of the Readings by one of the audience.

October of that year he was confirmed as Treasurer of the Middle Temple.¹ From this date until his flight from London in 1644 there is little of interest to note about him in the Temple.

The unhappy events of Lane's later career are better known and can be briefly stated. He was a devoted Royalist. His defences of Strafford, Berkely and the Twelve Bishops in 1640-2 were followed in 1644 by flight to Oxford, where he was successively knighted, called to be a sergeant and given the degree of D.C.L. In his absence the Benchers of his Inn, in obedience to an order of the Commons, gave to Bulstrode Whitelocke the chambers formerly occupied by Lane, and the books and manuscripts therein.² In 1645 Lane was made Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and in the next year he became Lord Keeper. After the surrender of Oxford in 1646 he went into exile with Prince Charles, and died in Jersey in 1650.³

At this point it is necessary to go back to a problem already indicated. In 1613 Lane was finally called to the bar; in 1627 he was appointed to stand at the Cupboard. He must have made some reputation as a lawyer. How had he done this? Foss was content to say that "it may be inferred that his early practice was in the Exchequer, from his Reports of Cases in that court from the 3rd to the 9th James I, 1605-1612".⁴ The

¹ *Minutes of Parliament*, ii, 843, 858.

² *Minutes of Parliament*, ii, 930. Whitelocke's receipt for these and for some books and manuscripts of Lord Littleton, dated 2 September 1646, is printed in F. Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii. (London, 1779), 366. According to Anthony Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, ii (London, 1820), 64, Lane's son went to Whitelocke to seek his father's papers, "but Whitlock would not own that he ever knew such a man as sir Richard, and therefore he kept what he had of his". Whitelocke nowhere in his *Memorials* mentions Lane's books and manuscripts, though he speaks of keeping Littleton's papers, "to have the present use of them, and resolving, if God gave us an happy accommodation, to restore them to the owner or to some of his family" (*Memorials of the English Affairs* (London, 1732), p. 172). An examination of the Whitelocke papers at Longleat, however, revealed only a copy of the original Commons order (vol. ix. fol. 18^r); nothing else relating to Lane seems to be there.

³ Lane's later career is well described in the *D.N.B.* The peculiar circumstances of his death and funeral in Jersey are given in *Northamptonshire Notes and Queries*, N.S., vol. v, pp. 162.

⁴ E. Foss, *The Judges of England*, vi (London, 1857), 341.

years of these reports are, of course, the years of Lane's student-ship, and naturally he plays no part in them. But even after his call, there is no mention of his name as counsel in any published report until the trial of Strafford in 1641. He could not, of course, appear in the Common Pleas where the sergeants still had the monopoly. The Exchequer suffers from lack of reporters at this period: "Lane" is too early for this purpose, "Jenkins Centuries"¹ contains few Exchequer cases and is mainly an abridgement of other reporters, Hardres² is too late. However, the reports attributed to Littleton,³ though predominantly from the Common Pleas, contain a selection of Exchequer cases from 3 and 4 Charles I in which many counsel are mentioned; but Lane makes no appearance. Though excluded from the Common Pleas, there was no reason why Lane should not have practised in the King's Bench, even if his main interest was in the Exchequer; many of the counsel mentioned in "Lane's" Reports in the Exchequer appear in King's Bench reports also. Not so Lane, who appears nowhere. Perhaps, then, Lane was not busy at Westminster but elsewhere. Several possibilities exist.

In the first place, Lane kept up his local connections in Northamptonshire. It was the custom of the Borough of Northampton to have an official for ordinary legal work called the town attorney or counsel, who was appointed for life. On the removal of Francis Tate to Wales in 1602 his place as attorney to the town was taken by Francis Harvey.⁴ According to one authority, in 1615 "Lane was chosen counsel for, or deputy recorder of, Northampton".⁵ There is no evidence for this in the manuscript Borough Books of Assembly, but two conveyances to the Corporation in 1622 are said to be done in the presence of Francis Harvey and Richard Lane; perhaps Lane was assistant to Harvey.⁶ In 1624 Harvey was appointed

¹ Published in Law French in 1661, and containing 800 cases from 1220 to 1623. ² Published in English in 1693, and covering the period 1655 to 1669.

³ Published in English in 1683, and covering the period 1626 to 1632; the doubt as to authorship comes from Wallace, *op. cit.* p. 266.

⁴ *Northampton Borough Records*, ii. 72.

⁵ *D.N.B.*

⁶ Stuart A. Moore, MS. Calendar of Northampton Borough Records (Northampton Borough Muniments), 1864, pp. 182, 187.

a judge of the Common Pleas, and on 24 January 1625 Lane succeeded him as attorney and was made a freeman of the Corporation.¹ In 1631 the Recorder of Northampton died, and on 20 February 1632 Lane was elected Recorder.² This progress in the town suggests that Lane may have been active locally, and perhaps travelled the Midland circuit, which began at Northampton. Unfortunately reporting was almost wholly confined to Westminster. Of the published reports the only exception for this period is Clayton's *Reports and Pleas of Assizes at Yorke*, and the manuscripts are not more helpful. There is nothing from the Midland circuit.³

A further possibility concerns Lane's relations with the Crown. His devotion in later years has already been noted; but as early as 1634 he had been made Attorney General to the Prince of Wales,⁴ and letters of that time show that he was busy on Royal affairs and declaring himself "most ready to set all private respects aside to wait upon his Majesty's service".⁵

This biographical detail shows that Lane is not a prominent candidate for authorship of the Reports. The Reports, according to the title-page, run from 1605 to 1611. Lane was not called until 1613. It would be necessary, then, to suppose that he wrote the reports while a student. It is true that students did write reports, but however natural it might be that a practitioner should confine his reporting to one court, it is surprising that a student should so restrict his activities, and even more surprising that he should choose the Exchequer. The evidence of the middle years does not help; Lane is office holder in his native Northampton, legal adviser to the Crown, perhaps on the Midland circuit or in Cambridge, but apparently not in the courts at Westminster. In his last years he became Lord Chief

¹ Northampton Borough Muniments, MS. Books of Orders of Assembly, i. 790.

² Ibid. ii. 21.

³ Nothing, that is to say, from an inspection of potentially helpful manuscript reports in the libraries searched for "Lane's" Reports.

⁴ *Cal. S.P. Dom. 1634-5*, p. 221.

⁵ *Hist. MSS. Comm. (Cowper)*, ii. 36 and 73. This last letter was written from Northampton. According to Barker and Stenning, *op. cit.* ii. 553, Lane was "counsel to Cambridge University, 1635".

Baron of the Exchequer, but his choice from among few candidates to preside over a Court lacking business does not make it necessary to suppose him learned in the ways of that Court.

So much for the evidence from Lane's career. Further negative evidence comes from the manuscripts. All the manuscripts which have been detailed above are in seventeenth century hands. Hb, indeed, can be dated before 1637, for it belonged to Sir Henry Calthorpe whose annotations it carries throughout, and Calthorpe died in that year. Moreover, Hb is one of the five manuscripts wholly or in part in the same hand, and this suggests that all five were the work of one agency at about this date or earlier. Yet not one of the manuscripts has an ascription to Lane in a contemporary hand. In fact, only three of them are catalogued as Lane's Reports (Ha, Hb and La), and in each case it is on the strength of identification by an antiquarian owner of the manuscript at a much later date, long after the printing of "Lane's" Reports.¹ It is particularly surprising that Calthorpe did not himself ascribe the reports in Hb to Lane, if they were his, for it will be remembered that he was a fellow member of the Middle Temple and had, with Lane, represented his Inn in talks with the Inner Temple in January 1637.²

It comes to this, then, that the only reason now apparent for attributing these reports to Lane is the fact that they were published seven years after his death in a volume which has no Introduction, which makes no attempt to explain the provenance of the manuscript, but simply asserts that the reports are by Lane.

It is time now to consider the second contention, that, whoever was the author of the reports, he never reported *Bate's Case*. The printer's manuscript does not seem to have survived, and so it is necessary to begin by comparing the printed book with those manuscripts which have come down to us. At once a

¹ Ha and Hb by Francis Hargrave (1741-1821); La by Edward Umfreville (flor. 1740-1758).

² *Supra*, p. 415. Moreover, the reports were not described as Lane's by the publishers when they entered them in the Stationers' Register; *infra*, p. 421.

remarkable fact appears, that *Bate's Case* is not reported in any of these manuscripts. The grouping of the manuscripts has been described above; whatever the variations, they have all in common the lack of *Bate's Case*. On the other hand, all the manuscripts in Group I (which most nearly approximates to the reports as printed) contain cases not found in the printed book. An analysis of Ha gives the following results. It contains 125 cases and short notes. Of these 125, 88 occur in the printed Reports, reduced in form to 86, and with 4 additions comprise the whole content of the published work.¹ These 90 cases and notes are all, with one exception, represented as being Exchequer cases.² There remain 37 cases in Ha which are not in print. They occur at fols. 18^v-21^r, 26^v-27^v, 28^r-33^v, 42^r-44^r, 45^v-47^v, i.e. they are well distributed throughout the manuscript. Twenty-six of these cases are said to be reported from Sergeants' Inn (as decisions of all the judges on commission, or error, or on removal from the Court of Wards); 2 from the Court of Wards; 8 from Exchequer Chamber on error; 1 only from the Exchequer.³ The significant fact, then, is that with only one exception either way, the cases included in the published volume purport to be Exchequer cases, and those excluded do not. Taken in conjunction with the presence in the published work of *Bate's Case*, this suggests that there may have been a

¹ The reduction from 88 to 86 is because *Bret v. Johnson*, which occurs in three stages in the manuscript (fols 5^r-9^r, 10^r-12^v, 15^v-17^v) is presented as one entry in the printed book (pp. 1-14). The four additions are the two cases and note not found in Ha (which are discussed *supra*, pp. 411-13), and *Bate's Case*.

² The exception is "*Wikes* by English Bill in the Exchequer Chamber Trin. 7 Jac." ("Lane", p. 54). This is not a real exception, for it is not an appeal in a Court of Exchequer Chamber but an instance of the Equity jurisdiction of the Exchequer in what Coke called "The Court of Equity in the Exchequer Chamber", 4 *Inst.*, 118; see Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, 5th edn., i. (London, 1931), 240-2.

³ The exception is *Waller v. Hanger* (Ha, fol. 39^r). A possible reason for its exclusion, if it was in the publishers' manuscript, is that a long report of the later stages of this case in the King's Bench had already been printed in Calthorpe's Reports, 33 (published 1655). Moreover, the trio had in hand the publication of Bulstrode's Reports (entered in the Stationers' Register 21 May 1656), of which the three volumes appeared in 1657, 1658, 1659; *Waller v. Hanger* is reported in 2 Bulst. 134, 261, and in 3 Bulst. 1. The many stages of this case, which was also reported in Moo. K.B. 1120 and 1 Rolle 138, are narrated by Coke C.J. at 3 Bulst. 20.

design to sell Exchequer cases, and to improve the sale by including *Bate's Case*.¹

This suggestion, however, rests only on evidence from extant manuscripts, which might differ materially from that used by the publisher. The nearest we can get to the original manuscript is the entry in the Stationers' Register made by the trio when they registered their manuscript with two other sets of reports on 31 May 1656.² The entry reads: "Entred under the hand of Master Norton, warden, a booke entituled . . . Reports in ye Exchequer Chamber beginning in the third of King James and ending in the 11th yeare of his reigne". The entry does not specifically identify the book as "Lane's" Reports, but the date, publishers and general description correspond too well to allow of any doubt. The entry is interesting in two ways. It mentions "Reports in ye Exchequer Chamber"; it covers the period 3-11 James I. The reference to the Exchequer Chamber is not conclusive of the presence of what we would call Exchequer Chamber cases, for it was not uncommon at that date to speak loosely of Exchequer cases as cases decided in the Exchequer Chamber. The dating, however, has a more direct bearing on the problem, for in Group I, as in this entry in the Register, the cases are dated from 3-11 James I whereas in the printed work the dating is from 3-9 James I.³

The Stationers' Register, then, adds some force to the suggestion that the publishers tampered with their manuscript in the way outlined above. It is necessary now to see what internal evidence the printed book affords of such an operation.

¹ Reference to the dates of publication given at p. 417 nn. 1, 2 and 3 will show that "Lane's" were the first Exchequer Reports ever to be printed, a point stressed by the publishers on their title page.

² H. R. Plomer, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers 1640-1708*, ii (London, 1913), 62. The significance of such an entry in the Register is discussed by R. B. McKerrow in *An Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 135-7. Entries of law books by the trio seem always to have been *before* publication, and probably on receipt of the manuscript rather than on completion of printing; e.g. Bulstrode's Reports were entered on 21 April 1656, but the last of the three volumes did not appear until 1659.

³ The last case in Group I is *Mrs. Chamberlain's Case*, which is there dated Mich. 11 Jac.; in the printed book the case appears between two of the extra cases not found in Group I (*Wickham v. Wood* and *Beckett's Case*, *supra*, p. 411), and is dated Pasch. 9 Jac.

It can be said at once that whether or not the trio acted the part of knaves, they certainly worked in a slipshod and clumsy way. The transcription and translation are not good.¹ For the present purpose, however, it is the dating that is of interest. Many of the cases have a date (term and regnal year) at their beginning, and on every page of the book there is a marginal heading of term and regnal year. This latter heading proceeds from Mich. 3 Jac. (p. 1) to Pasch. 9 Jac. (p. 119). Such a chronological progression gives the impression that the reporter, working solely in the Exchequer, reported term by term for nearly six years. Since James I began to rule on 24 March, the sequence of terms in a regnal year should be Pasch., Trin., Mich., Hil. In fact, the book begins with the sequence Mich. 3 Jac, Hil., Pasch., and Mich. 4 Jac., which suggests that these dates were written in by someone who had forgotten or never knew this fact. Much more interesting than this, however, is the demonstrable falsity of many of the dates, and the relation this has to *Bate's Case*. Before going into the detail of this matter it is not only fair to the publishers but relevant to the problem to say that the dating of the cases themselves follows fairly closely that given in most of the manuscripts.² The interest of this is that if the publishers accepted the dating of their manuscript, and if that dating were incorrect, then an attempt to insert a correctly dated case in its chronological order would not be difficult to detect. Now *Bate's Case* appears in the printed book under Mich. 4 Jac., which is the correct date.³ It is preceded in the book by a number of cases and short notes

¹ Whether or not the publishers used a manuscript more defective than those now extant, the following translations show little intelligence:

p. 55. "It was moved for the King upon a lease holden for him" for "move del Roy in un leete pur luy tenus".

p. 100. "I.S. was parson of D as appropriate" for "I.S. fuit person de D come improprie".

p. 117. "Yorke recovered by Indictment in the King's Bench against Allen upon an Assumpsit" for "Yorke recover per iudgment in Ba. le Roy", etc.

These examples are not unusual for law publishing at that date.

² There are slight variations among the manuscripts; for Calthorpe's attempt to correct some of the dates see the dating of *Bret v. Johnson*, *infra*, p. 423.

³ *Supra*, p. 408.

dated Mich. 3 Jac., Hil. and Pasch. 4 Jac. ; and it is followed by cases of Hil. 6 Jac., Pasch. and Trin. 7 Jac., and so on. All this is very proper in a chronological series ; yet, wherever it is possible to date from internal or other evidence the cases preceding *Bate's Case*, the result is to place them after and not before Mich. 4 Jac. The evidence to show that these cases were argued at a date later than *Bate's Case* is given below. The attempts to assign exact terms and years to the cases are not strictly necessary to this purpose, but if these conjectural dates are looked at as a series they will be seen to run from Pasch. 6 Jac. through Trin. to Mich. 6 Jac. It is for this reason that the manuscript order of cases has been retained, with *Bret. v. Johnson* appearing in three parts. The page and date references are to "Lane's" Reports, the folio references to Hb.

Bret v. Johnson. The three stages into which this is divided in the manuscripts (*supra*, p. 430, n. 1) correspond to three stages in the argument.

- (a) (pp. 1-8, fols. 3^r-8^r : dated Mich. 3 Jac.). Calthorpe altered the page heading in Hb from "M. 3 Jac." to "M. 5 Jac. argued Trin. 6 Jac." It is certainly at least as late as Trin. 5 Jac. for it refers to Popham as late Chief Justice, and he died on 10 June 1607. Probably Pasch. 6 Jac., the date given to it in British Museum, Add. MS. 35955, fol. 65^v (a different report of this first stage).

Case of Pirates' Goods (p. 15, fol. 8^v : dated Hil. 4 Jac.). There is no evidence to date this. Francis Hargrave's copy of the printed "Lane's" Reports now in the British Museum has a note in Hargrave's writing, "See Park Rep. in Scacc. 204, 205." I have not been able to identify these reports ; they are not printed.

The Case of Queen's College in Oxford (p. 15, fol. 8^v : dated Hil. 4 Jac.). Citation of Coke's Reports, vol. 6 (published 1607), and the appearance of Doddridge as King's Sergeant (created 25 June 1607) put the case at Trin. 5 Jac. at earliest. Probably Trin. 6 Jac., the date given in British Museum, Add. MS. 35955, fol. 70^v (a different report of the case).

Bret v. Johnson.

- (b) (pp. 8-12, fols. 9^v-12^v : dated Mich. 3 Jac.). This stage must be as late as Trin. 5 Jac., for Tanfield is Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer (appointed 25 June 1607). Probably Trin. 6 Jac., the date given in British Museum, Add. MS. 35955, fol. 69^r (a different report of this second stage).

Mayor of Lincoln's Case : Huddleston v. Hill : Prohibition to Ecclesiastical Courts (p. 16, fols. 12^v-13^r : dated Hil. 4 Jac.). In both Ha and Hb these cases are attributed to the King's Bench and dated Trin. 6 Jac. This

heading seems also to cover the following two cases. The only internal evidence is the name Williams as counsel or judge; probably Sir David Williams, a judge of the King's Bench from 1604 to 1613.

Skelton against the Lady Airie (p. 17, fol. 13^r: dated Hil. 4 Jac.). Internal evidence suggests the King's Bench, for the case is a Prohibition. In Ha and Hb it seems to be grouped under Trin. 6 Jac. with the three cases above. It is almost certainly an obscure version of a case reported as *Skelton v. Robert Atye* in British Museum, Add. MS. 35955, fol. 89^v; and as *Colton v. Dame Atee et sa fils* in Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg V-5, fol. 162^v. In both these reports the date, which is supported by internal evidence, is given as Trin. 6 Jac. in the King's Bench, and the latter report ends with a day given to Michaelmas Term for further argument.

Marie Reps against Babham (p. 17, fol. 13^r: dated Hil. 4 Jac.). This is the same case as *Reps v. Bonham*, printed in Yelverton's Reports 131 as of Trin. 6 Jac. in the King's Bench. Other reports are *Repps v. Bonham* (Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS. C 382, fol. 29^v); *Repps v. Bodham* (British Museum, Lansdowne MS. 1062, fol. 155^v), and *Bodham v. Reps* (Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg. V-5, fol. 163^r), all of which assign the case to Trin. 6 Jac. in the King's Bench.

Richards against Williams (p. 18, fol. 13^v: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). Judges mentioned are Chief Baron Tanfield (appointed 25 June 1607) and Baron "Hern" (i.e. Heron, appointed 5 November 1607) and so the case is at least as late as Mich. 5 Jac.

An Information against Page (p. 19, fol. 14^v: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). The only internal evidence is that Hitchcock and George Croke were opposing counsel. This is no help.

York and Allein (p. 20, fol. 15^r: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). The case is clearly an early stage of *Mrs. Chamberlain's Case* which appears at p. 117 in "Lane", but there is no evidence to date it.

Note on Copyholder (p. 20, fol. 15^r: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). No evidence.

Dennis against Drake (p. 20 fol. 15^r: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). Tanfield is Chief Baron and so the case must be Trin. 5 Jac. or later.

Saint Saviours in Southwark in an Information (p. 21, fol. 15^v: dated Pasch. 4 Jac.). Chief Baron Tanfield is again a judge, and so the case must be Trin. 5 Jac. or later. Moreover, it is an early stage of a case reported at length in 10 Co. Rep. 66a, where Coke states that the information "is entered Hil. 5 Jac.", which puts the case nearly a year later.

Three notes (p. 21, fol. 16^r: undated). No evidence.

Bret v. Johnson.

(c) (pp. 12-14, fols. 16^v-18^v: dated Mich. 3 Jac.). The text of the printed book and the manuscripts begins this part of the case "And after, Termino Mich. Anno Sexto Jacobi Regis". This is probably correct, for it fits with the dates for parts (a) and (b) of the case given above.

At this point in the printed book comes *Bate's Case*, dated Mich. 4 Jac. Since nearly all the surviving manuscripts make the same mistake with these early cases,¹ it is reasonable to suppose that the publishers fell into the common error and misplaced *Bate's Case* when they inserted it into their manuscript.

The evidence of the manuscripts of "Lane's" Reports, of the Stationers' Register and of the printed Reports themselves all goes to suggest that the publishers may have introduced *Bate's Case* into their Reports, which had been pruned of all but Exchequer cases and attributed to Lane. It is, of course, at best a plausible conjecture; it would have been helpful to have some contemporary advertisement by the trio to show whether any stress was laid on *Bate's Case*. It is true that the title-page comments on the Exchequer origin with some pride ("Being the first Collections in that Court hitherto extant") and that the 'Exact Table of the Principall Matters' refers to "An information against one for refusing to pay Impost for Currants, a famous Case";² but these are no more than the customary flourishes of the time, and no evidence of intent to deceive. It was at almost this very date that advertisements of current publications began to be carried at the back of printed books, but no such advertisement of "Lane's" Reports has been traced.³

In conclusion, it may be asked, where did the printed report of *Bate's Case* come from? As I have shown elsewhere, there was no lack of reports of this case, and at least six versions exist

¹ Calthorpe's amendments to Hb have been noted. The variations in A are mentioned under the several cases, but A is incomplete and cannot have served as model for the publishers.

² At the end of the book, unpagged.

³ E. Arber, "Contemporary Printed Lists of Books produced in England", *Bibliographia*, vol. iii (1897), suggested that the practice of putting a list of publications at the back of a book may have been begun by Philemon Stephens in 1656—this list is one of four in Bodleian Library, Wood MS. 22 D. None of the six volumes of reports published by the trio between 1657 and 1659 (*supra*, p. 405 n. 3) carries such a list in its present bound state in the Bodleian Library, but lists of this kind seem often to have been torn out preparatory to the binding of the book at a later date. "Lane's" Reports are noted in the 1657 edition of William London's *Catalogue of the most vendible books in England* (to 1 August 1657) but without any comment.

today.¹ The version used in "Lane's" Reports is a translation of a Law French report of *Bate's Case* to be found in British Museum, Lansdowne MS. 1,062 at fols. 188^v-197^r. This is itself a copy with scribal errors and omissions (it is almost certainly not the example used for the translation in "Lane"), but it is considerably better than the translation, making sense in some places where the English version does not. It occurs in a volume of cases which once belonged to E. Umfreville, whose comments on its origin are transcribed in the *Catalogue* of the Lansdowne Manuscripts.² Umfreville wrote of them as "Rant's Law Cases", and added that he had seen them elsewhere as "Reeve's Cases". Neither name is that of a published book of reports, and none of the cases in the manuscript which immediately precede or follow *Bate's Case* seems to have been printed. We are left, then, with an anonymous report from an unprinted collection, poorly transcribed and mistranslated,³ interpolated into another anonymous set of reports, the whole fathered by three Commonwealth publishers on to a dead

¹ These versions are listed and discussed in the article referred to *supra*, p. 408 n. 3.

² *A Catalogue of the Lansdowne Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1819), no. 1062.

³ As examples the following manuscript readings can be compared with the printed version from "Lane":

(a) p. 27: "and this power is guided by the Rules, which direct only at the Common Law".

fol. 193^r: et cest poer est guided per les rules queux direct solement al Comon bon".

In attempting to make sense of this passage about the absolute power of the King, G. W. Prothero, *Constitutional Documents of Elizabeth and James I*, 4th edn. (Oxford, 1913), p. 341, and J. R. Tanner, *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I* (Cambridge, 1930), p. 341, both insert "not" before "guided" as having been "accidentally omitted in the report" (Prothero). This explanation does not now seem likely.

(b) p. 28 (l. 10): "and so much for the person of Bates the subject".

fol. 194^r: et tant pour le person le roy et son power et son charge. Ore pour le person de Bates le subiect".

The omission in the printed book makes nonsense of the passage.

(c) p. 28 (11 lines from bottom): "this hurteth not the merchant, nor no other, but only a small number of delicate persons, and those also who are of most able and best estate, for their pleasure, but when

Royalist lawyer. This is not the safest sort of material on which to rely in writing constitutional history, *a fortiori* if other material lies ready to hand.

the King is in want, he is to be relieved by a general imposition or subsidie upon all the subjects".

fol. 194^v: "delicate persons, et ceux auxi que sont de plus able, et melior est de levy argent en cest manner de les rich pur lour pleasure, que en want de ce est reliefe per un generall impost ou subsidie sur tous les subiects" (my punctuation).

"Est" is not "estate"; the omitted words wholly change the sense.

ST. PAUL IN GREECE: THE LETTERS TO THE THESSALONIANS ¹

By T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.LITT., D.D., F.B.A.

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

RECENTLY the authorities of the Greek Orthodox Church celebrated the nineteen-hundredth anniversary of the bringing of the Christian faith to their land by St. Paul. It is an event that deserved to be celebrated; for it is one of the momentous things in the history of mankind. Somewhere about the same time the new faith came to Macedonia, it must also have arrived in Rome, perhaps a little earlier; and that, too, was an event which was destined to have great consequences. It is interesting to compare the two arrivals of Christianity in Europe. We know who brought it to Greece; we can fix the date with reasonable precision; and we can at least draw up an outline account of the reception given to the first missionaries. On the beginnings of the Church in Rome we are much less well informed. We do not know who first brought the good news; we do not know when it arrived or how it was received. We do know that when Paul wrote to Rome, in A.D. 55 or a year or two later, there was already a Christian community there. We may suppose that in the constant coming and going between the capital and the provinces it was inevitable that before long Christians should arrive in the city, brought there by business interests or by the nature of their work ² or simply by the normal operations of the

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 12th of November 1952.

² Thus, for example, one of our oldest Christian private letters (*B.G.U.*, I. 27, ii/iii A.D.) is from a certain Irenaeus, one of the crew of a grain-ship plying between Egypt and Italy. While his ship was lying in port, he had taken the opportunity to go to Rome and visit the Christian community there. It is interesting to note that the term used for the Church is *ὁ τόπος*, on which see the note in my article on the Corinthian Correspondence (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. xxvi (1941), pp. 119 f.). We can readily imagine Christians

slave-market. There is nothing to suggest that the foundation of the Roman community was part of an organized missionary campaign such as St. Paul conducted in Greece.

The story of how this campaign began is told in Acts xv and xvi. The Conference at Jerusalem, which had laid down the terms on which Jewish and Gentile Christians should have table-fellowship, was over. Paul and Barnabas, accompanied by two leading members of the Jerusalem community, Judas Barsabbas and Silas, had returned to Antioch and delivered the letter from the Conference. After a time Judas and Silas, or Judas alone,¹ returned to Jerusalem, while Paul and Barnabas stayed in Antioch teaching and preaching. The narrative of Acts goes on to tell how Paul suggested to Barnabas that they should revisit the South Galatian churches founded on the first missionary journey. The plan fell through because of a disagreement over Mark, whom Barnabas wanted as travelling companion and Paul did not. In the end Barnabas took Mark and went to Cyprus, while Paul, accompanied by Silas, took the overland route into Asia Minor.²

The activities of Paul and Silas are described in Acts xvi. 1-5, very summarily indeed. We hear of visits of Derbe and Lystra and of the circumcision of Timothy, who was at this time added to Paul's staff. Many students of Acts and the Pauline epistles have felt a serious difficulty here in view of Paul's emphatic repudiation of circumcision in his letter to the Galatians.³ I think that the difficulty is greatly reduced if we arriving in Rome at an earlier period in similar ways. Tertullian (*Apol.* 42) bears witness that Christians in his day were engaged in trade and shipping as well as in agriculture.

¹ Acts xv. 33 ff. The text is in some uncertainty. The Western and Byzantine evidence in verse 34 asserts that Silas stayed in Antioch by his own choice. This statement is absent from the B text. It may be that it is a later insertion to pave the way for the announcement in verse 40 that Paul took Silas with him on the second missionary campaign. On the other hand, the statement that Paul took Silas is strange, if Silas had left Antioch for Jerusalem. If it is another Silas that is meant in verse 40, it must be said that he is very abruptly introduced.

² Acts xv. 36-41. It is worth noticing that what in fact happened was that the places visited on the first journey were divided for the second. Cyprus, which Barnabas took on the second trip, had been the first place to be evangelized in the previous campaign.

³ Gal. v. 2 ff.

can accept the interpretation of the second chapter of Galatians which I proposed in 1940,¹ namely, that the issue of circumcision was not raised as a matter of principle till a much later date, when Paul was at Ephesus during the third missionary journey. On the second journey Paul was still trying to work through the synagogues of the Dispersion; and it was surely desirable from a practical point of view that he and his lieutenants should be qualified to address the synagogue congregations. So long as Timothy was uncircumcised he was disqualified from taking any active part in the synagogue service. It may well have seemed *at this time* that the operation was a small price to pay for the advantages that would accrue to the missionary enterprise.

We are told that the findings of the Jerusalem Conference were communicated to the churches; and that, as a result of the visit by the missionaries, the churches were strengthened in the faith and increased in number daily.

As we read this account of the second journey through South Galatia we get the impression that it is being hurried over. Either the writer is in haste to come to new developments of his theme, or, possibly, Paul himself was in a hurry to break new ground, his restless spirit demanding new worlds to conquer for the Kingdom of God. However it may be, the fact is that in three verses Paul is transported from South Galatia to Troas in the north-west corner of Asia Minor; and Troas marks a turning-point in the story second only to Antioch in importance.² For it is here that Paul has the dream in which he sees a Macedonian who begs him to "come over into Macedonia and help us".³ He and his associates interpret the dream as a call from God to extend the work of evangelization to Macedonia.⁴

¹ Cf. BULLETIN OF J.R.L., vol. xxiv (1940).

² Acts xvi 4 f.

³ Lake and Cadbury remind us that the question has been raised how Paul knew that he was a Macedonian; and say that "to ask this is contrary to the psychology of dreams". As to the psychology of dreams I say nothing: I would say that to ask this is contrary to common sense. If someone comes to me and says "Come over into Scotland and help us", I shall assume that he is a Scot, without requiring that he wear a kilt and play a selection on the bagpipes to prove his identity. And in most cases I shall expect my guess to be correct.

⁴ Acts xvi. 9 f.

It is at this point that the first large stretch of narrative in the first person plural begins : " And when he saw the vision, immediately we began planning how to get away to Macedonia, concluding that God had called us to bring the gospel to them." This " we-section " continues as far as verse 17, when the party is at Philippi. From that point the third person is used until we come to xx. 6, again at Philippi, where the first person is resumed. There is a good deal to be said for the hypothesis that the person who speaks in this " we-section " is left behind when Paul leaves Philippi and remains in that neighbourhood until he is rejoined there by Paul in xx. 6.

The narrative of the journey from Troas is simple and straightforward. The sea passage with a favourable wind took two days and the party landed safely at Neapolis, the modern Cavalla, where they could join the great Roman trunk road, the *Via Egnatia*. From Neapolis they went to Philippi, and there the usual procedure in Pauline missionary work was followed. He began with the synagogue and converted a seller of purple-dyed wool from Thyatira, who entertained the missionaries in her house. In Acts xvi. 24 her name is given as Lydia ; but it has been suggested by Johannes Weiss ¹ that this was a second name arising from that fact that Thyatira was a Lydian city, and that possibly the lady's personal name was Euodia or Syntyche.² After the story of Lydia the narrative of Acts goes on to describe how Paul exorcised an oracular spirit from a slave-girl, thus depriving her owners of a valuable source of income. They take action, and Paul and Silas are beaten and imprisoned. During the night there is an earthquake : the jailer and his family are converted, and next morning the prisoners are released. Paul makes formal protest at having been beaten, a punishment which ought not to be inflicted on a Roman citizen. This, we are told, caused some alarm among the Philippian magistrates, who came and asked them to do the city the favour of leaving it without delay. So they left, with the nucleus of a church established at the Thyatiran wool shop. As we know, this church grew and flourished, and remained the most consistently faithful to the Apostle of all his foundations. They

¹ *Das Urchristentum*, p. 211.

² Cf. Phil. iv. 2.

sent gifts to him from time to time ; and, as we can see from the letter to the Philippians, they were very dear to him.

From Philippi the missionaries followed the Egnatian way through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, the modern Salonika. Here again Paul begins in the synagogue and makes converts, particularly among the adherents, that is, those Greeks who found the God of Israel more like their idea of what a God should be than any of the numerous occupants of their own Pantheon. For three Sabbaths Paul had had access to the Jewish congregation before opposition began to develop. Once aroused it no doubt quickly came to a head and before long a crowd, organized by the Jews, was demonstrating in front of the house where Paul and his friends were lodged. Failing to find the missionaries, they seized their host, Jason by name, and some of the converts, and brought them before the city magistrates alleging that the new religion was in fact revolutionary propaganda aimed at the overthrow of the Empire. The magistrates acted cautiously and contented themselves, for the time being, with binding Jason and the others over not to harbour seditious persons.¹ This left the Thessalonian Christians with no alternative but to rid themselves of the incriminating evidence, in this case Paul and his assistants, as quickly and as quietly as possible. Accordingly Paul and Silas were sent away under cover of darkness to Beroea, a city lying about fifty miles to the west of Thessalonica on the road to Athens.²

At Beroea the starting-point for the work was again the synagogue ; and here the response was enthusiastic, many converts being made. But news of their success came back to Thessalonica ; the synagogue authorities there took action and disturbances began in Beroea. Paul had to move on leaving Silas and Timothy behind. His Beroean escort brought him to Athens and returned home with instructions to Silas and Timothy to follow and report to their chief as quickly as possible.³

In Athens Paul saw the whole apparatus of Greek religion displayed in the most impressive form. He saw entire and complete those temples and statues of which the battered and broken remains are still among the wonders of the world. The

¹ Acts xvii. 1-9.

² Acts xvii. 10.

³ Acts xvii. 11-15.

sight filled him with horror. He began a campaign for monotheism in the market-place and for Christian monotheism in the synagogue. In the market-place he found plenty to argue with him. The philosophically minded were prepared to talk about the nature of ultimate Reality endlessly; but as soon as Paul proposed to bring into the debate more particular matters such as Jesus and the resurrection, they became acutely aware of the "scandal of particularity" and concluded that it was not a genuine thinker that they were dealing with, but just another agent of some Oriental cult. In the end Paul appeared before the Areopagus and made a statement which is recorded in Acts xvii. 22-32. The results of this effort in Athens were disappointing and Paul later moved on to Corinth,¹ where he carried on an active and successful ministry for some eighteen months.

In his first letter to the Corinthians he reminds them that he came to Corinth in deep depression;² and it is open to us to think that his loss of confidence was due, in part at least, to the comparative failure of his effort at Athens. But not to this alone. Athens was his fourth attempt in Europe. In the first three his activities had been cut short just when he was getting a church well started; while at Athens his presentation of the gospel in a manner likely to be acceptable to a cultured and philosophical audience had fallen flat. It would not be tried again. He tells the Corinthians, "I made up my mind that among you my one and only subject would be Jesus the Messiah, and a crucified Messiah at that". We may perhaps think also that the polemic against the wisdom of this world in the early chapters of First Corinthians gains added point from his own experiments with it at Athens.

The letters to the Thessalonians belong to this period of Paul's life. They were written after his departure from Thessalonica and before his departure from Corinth. Our first task is to see whether we can give approximate dates to these events. The one secure link with secular chronology is the fact recorded in Acts that Paul was brought before Gallio, the proconsul of Achaëa. It is possible on the basis of inscriptions and other

¹ Acts xvii. 32-xviii. 1.

² 1 Cor. ii. 1-5.

evidence to date the proconsulship of Gallio with considerable confidence.¹ The most important piece of evidence is the well-known inscription from Delphi giving the decision of the Emperor Claudius on some local dispute which had been referred to him by the proconsul Gallio. The document is dated in the 12th year of the Emperor's tribunicial power, that is, sometime between 25 January 52 and 24 January 53. It is also in the period between the 26th and 27th acclamations of Claudius as *imperator*. It is known from other sources that the 27th acclamation took place before 1 August 52, how long before we cannot say. The 26th acclamation *may* have fallen in Claudius's 11th year: if so, it must probably have been late in the year since four others would have to be fitted in before it. It follows that the Delphi case was considered in Rome and the decision issued between the latter part of 51 and 1 August 52 at the outside. More probably the limits should be narrowed to the period February-July 52. Further, Gallio must have been in office before the date of the decision, since it was he who had dealt with the case in its preliminary stages and had referred it to the Emperor. Now if Gallio took office in 52, arriving at Corinth in early summer, there is perhaps time for him to have completed the first hearing, prepared a report and sent it to Rome; then for the report to have gone through the usual channels, for the Imperial decision to have been taken and transmitted from Rome to Gallio; all before the 27th acclamation which occurred some time before 1 August. There is perhaps time; but at best it would be a tight fit. If, on the other hand, Gallio arrived at Corinth in the early summer of 51 there is ample time for all the coming and going. I therefore think that there is a slight balance of probability in favour of the view that Gallio was in office from the early summer of 51 to the early summer of 52, assuming that his proconsulship lasted one year.

If we now make the further assumptions that the charge against Paul was made near the end of his stay in Corinth and near the beginning of Gallio's term of office, we get the early

¹ The relevant texts are given and discussed by Kirsopp Lake in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 460-4.

summer of 51 as the date of the hearing ; and by reckoning back eighteen months from this point we come to late 49 or early 50 as the date of Paul's arrival in Corinth. This means that the events described in Acts xvi. and xvii. will be assigned to the year 49. The letters to the Thessalonians will fall somewhere within the period of two years between the summer of 49 and the summer of 51.

From the letters themselves we learn that in spite of hostility and ill-treatment the Apostles had made a good beginning with the building up of the church at Thessalonica. They had put their hearts into the work and they had had their reward in that the gospel was taken up and held fast by their converts in spite of strong opposition and even persecution. In 2 Thess. ii. 9 Paul mentions that during his stay at Thessalonica he earned his own living working at his trade, so as not to be a burden on the brethren. He was thus able to rebut the charge, which was made against him by opponents, that he was out for gain.¹

But these are not the only facts to emerge from the study of the letters. We learn from 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 5 that the narrative of Acts is anything but complete. As we have already seen, when Paul left Beroea, Silas and Timothy remained behind ; and the Beroean escort who had accompanied Paul to Athens brought back a message to them to follow Paul *to Athens*. Now Acts makes no mention that this instruction was ever carried out : Silas and Timothy do not reappear on the scene in Acts until xviii. 5, when Paul is already in Corinth. There would seem to be two possibilities. Either Paul left Athens so soon that Silas and Timothy had not time to overtake him there ; or they did come to Athens and the fact is not recorded in Acts. A consideration of 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 5 suggests that the second alternative is to be preferred. In this passage Paul says :

But we, brethren, being bereaved of you for a short season, in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more exceedingly to see your face with great desire : because we would fain have come again unto you, I Paul once and again ; and Satan hindered us. . . . Wherefore when we could no longer forbear we thought it good to be left behind at Athens alone ; and sent Timothy, our brother and God's minister in the gospel of Christ, to strengthen and encourage you in the matter of your faithfulness ; so that no one should be shaken by these afflictions ;

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 5.

for you yourselves know that hereunto we are appointed. . . . For this cause I also, when I could no longer forbear, sent that I might know your faith, lest by any means the tempter had tempted you, and our labour should be in vain.

From this it appears that Timothy, and probably Silas also, did come to Athens as instructed ; and further that, while Paul was still at Athens, Timothy was sent on a mission to Thessalonica. It is therefore presumably the return from that errand that is recorded in Acts xviii. 5 at Corinth. It is also clear that Paul had good reason to be anxious about the welfare of the Thessalonian community. The Christians there were suffering persecution, and there was the ever-present danger that their faith might break down under stress of loss and suffering. Moreover, even when Timothy was able to bring good news of them, it was clear to Paul that their faith was by no means perfect : he says that he wishes he could be with them in person to make up their deficiencies in this respect.¹

Now it is surely probable that if Paul felt as strongly as he says he did about Thessalonian affairs, he would not only send Timothy, but also send with him a letter containing his own personal message. As long ago as the seventeenth century Hugo Grotius maintained that this was done and that 2 Thess. was the letter in question.² In more recent times the thesis of the priority of 2 Thess. has been defended again and again : I mention two of the latest defenders : J. C. West, who discussed the problem in the *Journal of Theological Studies*,³ and Johannes Weiss, who dealt with it in his *Urchristentum*.⁴ It seems to me to offer the best explanation of the facts. Before giving the reasons for holding it, we may consider the alternatives.

The Tübingen School rejected both Thessalonian epistles as spurious. Modern critical opinion on the Continent has tended to accept 1 Thess. and reject 2 Thess. The reason is that when you have read the first letter, the second appears like a pale ghost of its neighbour. As Johannes Weiss puts it,⁵ "the majority of critical scholars are doubtful of the genuineness of

¹ 1 Thess. iii. 10.

² *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*, i (Amsterdam, 1641), 1032-42 ; ii (Paris, 1646), 651.

³ "The Order of 1 and 2 Thessalonians", *J.T.S.*, vol. xv (1914), pp. 66-74.

⁴ *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 213-23.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 217, n. 2.

2 Thess. ; for, since they only read it in the shadow of 1 Thess., it appears to them as an insignificant and empty copy of 1|Thess.”. So Jülicher in the seventh edition of his *Introduction* decides after considerable discussion that on the whole the best way of dealing with 2 Thess. is to cast it out of the authentic Pauline corpus. He may be regarded as a typical representative of the school referred to by Weiss.

The second alternative was proposed by Harnack in a paper read before the Berlin Academy in 1910. His thesis is that the likenesses between the two letters may be explained if we suppose that they were written at about the same time to two different addresses in Thessalonica. 1 Thess. was sent to the Gentile section of the Thessalonian church : 2 Thess. was written almost immediately afterwards for the Jewish Christian section of the same community. This view was adopted by Kirsopp Lake and fully discussed by him in his important work *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*.¹ Its chief weakness is that it puts too great a strain on the imagination. It is more than difficult to see how Paul, who lays such great stress on the unity of the Church, should have consented to recognize a cleavage of this sort by writing two letters to two sections of one Christian community. Further, there is no sign in the letters themselves of any such intention. They are both addressed to the Thessalonian church as a whole. And there is no sort of real evidence that any division of the kind suggested existed at Thessalonica. The evidence rather seems to point the other way. For example, 1 Thess. ii. 13-16, which on the two-addressee hypothesis is intended for the *Gentile-Christian* section in Thessalonica, speaks in a very appreciative way of the churches in Judaea and practically congratulates the readers of the letter on having been imitators of these Jewish Christians.

We may now turn to consider the view that both letters are genuine, and that 2 Thess. was written first. The arguments on which Weiss rested his case are as follows.

¹ Pp. 61-101. This view is still held to be the most probable in *An Introduction to the New Testament* by K. and S. Lake (1938), pp. 131-6. There the view is taken that 2 Thess. was somewhat later than 1 Thess., and was written to the Jewish Christians in Thessalonica after “Paul had received some communication which made him realise that 1 Thessalonians was not quite satisfactory”.

1. The Thessalonian community had to endure a good deal of persecution for their faith. These trials and tribulations are at their height in 2 Thess. : they are spoken of as past in 1 Thess.

(a) The troubles are present in 2 Thess. At the very beginning of the letter, immediately after the opening salutations, Paul speaks of conditions in Thessalonica. He commends the growing faith and love that are manifest in the life of the community and then goes on :

And so we on our part are boasting about you in all the churches of God for your steadfastness and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which you are enduring. It is evidence of the just judgement of God that you should be adjudged worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are suffering (granted that God holds it right to repay with affliction those who are afflicting you, and to grant rest with us to you who are at present afflicted, which he will do when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven . . .).¹

Here the contrast is between the trials which the Thessalonians are at the moment enduring and the very different lot which will be theirs at the Parousia. Then the situation will be reversed : those who are now being harried will receive their reward in the kingdom of God, and those who now reject the gospel and persecute the believers will receive dire punishment. In the meantime the faithful must continue faithful ; and the missionaries pray constantly for them that they may be worthy of their high destiny.²

They must be faithful : they must also be imperturbable. Whatever excited members may say in ecstasy or in the heat of preaching or teaching, even if documents come purporting to be from Paul himself, the Thessalonians are to keep their heads. The Parousia has not come and will not come before the powers of darkness have had their last fling. Before the real Parousia there must be a Satanic imitation of it, the revelation of the lawless one with all the apparatus of bogus signs and wonders. This will precipitate the end. The Lord Jesus will slay the pretender with the breath of his mouth.³ Come what may the recipients of the letter can rejoice, as its writer does, in the knowledge that they have received and responded to the call of God and that their future is safe in his hands.⁴

¹ 2 Thess. i. 4-7.

² 2 Thess. i. 11 f.

³ 2 Thess. ii. 1-12.

⁴ 2 Thess. ii. 13-iii. 5.

Next comes a particular warning made necessary by the fact that some members of the Thessalonian church have been carried off their feet by the expectation of an imminent Parousia, and have abandoned their normal life with its tasks and responsibilities. They are living in idleness waiting for the end ; and they expect others to supply their needs while they wait. Paul's direction is that they must work and earn their own living, and that nothing is to be done by the community to encourage members in lazy and parasitic ways of life.¹ The letter closes with a note of authentication and blessings.

Read thus in its own light, and without asking about its relation to 1 Thess., it is a remarkably vivid picture that is presented : the picture of a young community on tip-toe of expectation, looking eagerly for the great divine intervention that is to end the existing order and usher in the better world which has been prepared for the faithful. The hope of this golden age just round the corner makes it easier to put up with the eccentricities of some members, and to bear the insults and injuries which are the daily portion of the young church. The letter deals simply and directly with these points. Regarding the Parousia it says that the end is not yet ; and therefore the members of the church must carry on with their ordinary duties and bear their persecutions with patience and fortitude.

(b) When we turn from this simple note to 1 Thess., we are at once conscious that we have before us a more deliberate and carefully thought out letter. After the usual opening salutations it embarks on a detailed survey of the history of the church in Thessalonica from its first beginnings to the moment of writing. In the first chapter we have words of praise and thanksgiving for the remarkable progress made by the church, progress which is well known in Christian centres throughout Macedonia and Achaëa. The second chapter is mainly concerned with Paul himself. Verses 1-12 give an account of his missionary work in Thessalonica with a good deal of emphasis on the purity of its motives and the unselfishness of its methods. Paul stresses the fact that when he was with them he was self-supporting, maintaining himself by working at his own trade. Then

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 6-15.

we have four verses on the relation of the Thessalonian community to the original Jewish-Christian community in Palestine : Macedonian Christianity is modelled on Judæan ; and relations appear to be completely friendly. The only hostility to the spread of the gospel in lands outside Palestine comes from pagans or unconverted Jews. Paul's indignation with the latter is readily understandable when we remember that his missionary strategy, which was to use the synagogues of the Dispersion as landing-beaches for his assault on paganism, had been thwarted by the action of the synagogues themselves. Verses 17-20 explain, in somewhat cryptic terms ("Satan hindered us"),¹ why Paul had not been able to pay another visit to Thessalonica, though plans had been made for it at least twice. Instead he had sent Timothy to strengthen and encourage them in their loyalty to their religion,² so that none of them should be shaken³ by the troubles they were going through, since such things are involved in being a Christian. At a still earlier stage, when he was still with them, he had warned them of what he and they would have to bear ; and his predictions had been fully justified by the event, as the Thessalonians knew only too well. After this short digression Paul returns to the situation as it appeared to him when he was at Athens. At length his anxiety became

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 18. Various explanations, none entirely free from objection, have been offered of the meaning of the phrase. They are admirably summarized in Frame's note in his commentary, p. 121. If we are not to leave the reference indefinite, we may perhaps think of some illness of Paul, comparing 2 Cor. xii. 7. See E. B. Allo's Commentary on 2 Cor. (*Études Bibliques*), pp. 313-23. The objection that it is unlikely that Paul, Silas, and Timothy would all be ill at the same time is met by the consideration that a visit by all three might well have to be postponed if the senior and most important member of the party fell ill.

² I think that *ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* refers to the faithfulness of the Thessalonian Christians to their profession, as in 2 Thess. i. 4 where it is set alongside *ὑπομονή*.

³ The verb used here, *σαίνεσθαι*, has provoked much discussion and a good deal of conjectural emendation. There is a small amount of evidence that it can mean "to be disurbed". Bauer (*Wörterbuch* ⁴ s.v. *σαίνω*) cites Sophocles, *Ant.* 1214 *παῖδός με σαίνει φθόγγος* and Diog. Laert. 8, 41 *οἱ σαινόμενοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ἐδάκρυον*. To these examples Mr. H. Chadwick, in *J.T.S.* (N.S., vol. i (1950), pp. 156 ff.), adds from the recently recovered *Dialogue of Origen with Heraclides*, *τὰ μὲν περὶ πίστεως, ὅσα ἔσθην ἡμᾶς, συνεξετάσθη*, "all the questions about the faith which disturbed us have been examined". This seems to be enough to justify the rendering adopted in the text.

unbearable ; and, since he could not go to Thessalonica himself, he sent Timothy to find out whether they were still faithful,¹ or whether the tempter had seduced them and brought the labour of the missionaries to nothing.²

It is clear that the afflictions described here are things that were happening some time before the writing of the present letter. In ii. 14 (ἐπράθετε), similarly, the persecution is something past, and apparently not continuing into the present. In iii. 4 it is something they had been duly warned about before it happened : then it happened, and now they know by their own experience what is involved in being a Christian in a pagan world. But nowhere in 1 Thess. is there anything to suggest that the persecution is still in progress. On the contrary, the passage,³ in which Paul speaks of Timothy's return and report and of his own feelings on receiving it, suggests very strongly that the Thessalonian community is for the moment free from outside interference. This is borne out by the fact that the Apostle's further counsels and exhortations all have to do with the internal discipline of the church and not with resistance to external enemies.

The trials and persecutions, which are a present threat in 2. Thess., are a thing of the past in 1 Thess. The inference is that 1 Thess. is the later document.

2. The internal difficulties of the Thessalonian church are in 2 Thess. a new development of which the writers of the letter have just heard. In 1 Thess. they are referred to as completely familiar to all concerned.

(a) In 2 Thess. iii. 11 ff. it is said :

We are informed that some of you are behaving irresponsibly, busybodies ⁴ very busy doing nothing. Such persons we urge with all the authority that we have under the Lord Jesus Christ to settle down quietly to work and earn a

¹ I take πίστιν in verse 5 to mean " faithfulness " as in verse 2.

² 1 Thess. iii. 1-5.

³ 1 Thess. iii. 6-10, followed by a blessing in verses 11-13.

⁴ περιεργαζομένους. There is a play upon words in the Greek, which I have tried to represent in the translation. Theophrastus describes περιεργία in *Char.* xiii. His περιεργος is a fool, a fussy and inept meddler in other people's affairs. At a later time other and more reprehensible qualities came to be attached to the word. For these see Farquharson's commentary on Marcus Aurelius, vol. ii. pp. 490 f.

living for themselves. And you brethren who are already behaving properly—keep it up ! If anyone refuses to obey this written instruction of ours, let him be a marked man, have nothing to do with him, that he may be shamed (into obedience). Do not regard him as an enemy, but warn him as a brother.

All this is news which the writers of the letter have just learned about the troublesome minority at Thessalonica ; and they give immediate instructions how the matter is to be dealt with. They also remind the members of the community that when they were at Thessalonica founding the church there, they had inculcated the virtues of honest work, both by precept and example¹ ; but they do not refer to any earlier letter, as we might expect, if 1 Thess. had preceded 2 Thess.

(b) When we turn to 1 Thess. we find references to the disorders dealt with in 2 Thess. ; but they do not suggest that the disorders are a new thing. On the contrary, they allude to them as matters already well known to both the readers and the writers of 1 Thess. When the writers say, “ we exhort you brethren, warn the irresponsible ”, the full force of the exhortation is not appreciated unless we have in mind the things said in 2 Thess. iii. 11 ff. The same applies to the injunctions in 1 Thess. iv. 10-12. In this passage the writers refer to a specific injunction which they had previously given (*καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν*, verse 11). It may well be that this is a reference to the injunction of 2 Thess. iii. 12 (*τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις παραγγέλλομεν, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ*).

The data concerning the internal difficulties at Thessalonica are best understood if we take 2 Thess. to be the earlier letter of the two.

3. The emphasis on the autograph closing greetings as a mark of genuineness in any letter claiming to be from Paul is pointless except in a first letter. The passage runs :

The greeting of me, Paul, in my own handwriting. This is the mark (of genuineness) in every letter (of mine). This is the way I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all (2 Thess. iii. 17 f.).

That the warning against spurious letters purporting to come from the Apostle was not superfluous is clear from 2 Thess. ii. 2, where Thessalonians are warned against allowing themselves to

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 6-10.

be misled by such forged documents. The statement in iii. 17 was fully discussed by O. Roller.¹ After careful consideration of similar passages in 1 Cor. xvi. 21 ; Gal. vi. 11 ; Col. iv. 18 ; Phil. v. 19, he concludes that the purpose of the note is to draw attention to the fact that there is no change of handwriting such as would appear if a secretary wrote the main body of the letter and the Apostle added only the concluding greetings. If Paul himself wrote the whole of 2 Thess. the purpose of the note in iii. 17 is to say : " This is my handwriting. I may not always write the whole letter myself, as I have done in this case ; but I always write the closing greeting at least, and it will be in this handwriting. No letter without it is genuine." This intimation is very much to the point, if 2 Thess. is the first genuine letter of Paul to come to the Thessalonian church—they had already had at least one that was not genuine. The question may well be asked, why the Thessalonians should accept the document and the handwriting as Paul's merely because it claimed to be his. To this the answer will be that if, as has been suggested already, Timothy was the bearer of the letter, its authenticity would be independently guaranteed. The already known messenger authenticates the first letter : the already known handwriting will authenticate any future communication.

4. The statement (1 Thess. v. 1) that the Thessalonians have no need to be instructed about times and seasons is very much to the point, if the readers are already acquainted with the contents of 2 Thess. ii., where the time of the Parousia is dealt with at some length and in considerable detail.

So far I have taken the points made by Weiss, elaborating and adding to them where necessary. I now go on to some further considerations.

5. In 1 Thess. iv. 9-v. 11 we have a series of three didactic sections each introduced by the formula " Now concerning . . . ".² This formula is familiar to us from 1 Cor. There it occurs six times, beginning with vii. 1, *περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε*,

¹ *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe* (1933), pp. 187-91.

² These are : iv. 9 *περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας*, iv. 13 *περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων*, v. 1 *περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν*.

which makes it clear that the Apostle is replying to points raised in a letter from the Corinthians to him. An exact parallel from outside the Bible is to be seen in the letter of the Emperor Claudius to the citizens of Alexandria¹ dated A.D. 41, less than a decade before the writing of 1 Thess. Here the Emperor says (ll. 52 f.) "Concerning the requests which you are anxious that I should grant I decide as follows". The decisions follow. In line 66 we find, "Concerning the matter of the Senate . . .", followed by an intimation of the steps being taken. We may therefore surmise that in 1 Thess. Paul is replying point by point to questions raised at Thessalonica and communicated to him either in a letter or verbally by Timothy. Now if 2 Thess. was taken to Thessalonica by Timothy, we should expect that the three points now to be dealt with will have arisen from statements made in 2 Thess. Let us see if this is the case.

(a) Concerning love of the brotherhood,² you have no need of anyone to write to you ; for you yourselves are taught by God to love one another. What is more, you are putting it into practice in your treatment of all the brethren in Macedonia. But we urge you, brethren, to achieve even more, to make it your ambition to live quietly, to mind your own business, and to work with your own hands,³ as we instructed you ; that your behaviour may win the respect of outsiders and you yourselves be independent.⁴

In this passage the words "as we instructed you" may well be, as suggested above, a reference to the specific instruction given in 2 Thess. iii. 12. If that is so, the passage as a whole may be the answer to supplementary questions arising out of the whole passage 2 Thess. iii. 6-15. It may be, for example, that the strong measures proposed for dealing with the irresponsible minority were thought to be somewhat drastic, not least by the minority themselves. What becomes of the love of the brotherhood if members of it are to be treated in this way? The

¹ P. Lond. 1912. The text of this important document was published with introduction, translation, and commentary by H. I. Bell in the volume *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (1924), pp. 1-37.

² Cf. F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (1947), p. 84 : "φιλadelphia does not mean 'brotherly love' in general, but quite specifically 'the love of the (Christian) brotherhood', the mutual love which binds together the children of God in one family".

³ Cf. M. Aur., i. 5, where these two things come in the reverse order : τὸ αὐτουργικὸν καὶ ἀπολύπραγμον.

⁴ 1 Thess. iv. 9-12.

answer is that the Thessalonian community has shown, and is showing, that it understands very well what love of the brotherhood means, both within its own circle and in the wider field. There is, however, room for improvement; and that will come when it is realized by all that genuine love of the brotherhood includes not being parasitic on the brotherhood.

(b) The second section begins, "We do not wish you to remain ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are at rest, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope". It then goes on to explain that Christians who die before the Parousia will not be at any disadvantage when the Lord returns. On the contrary, they will have a certain priority: they will be raised from the dead first, and then those Christians who are still alive will be caught up along with them to meet the Lord in the air.

It seems clear that this is the answer to a question which must have run something like this: "What about the good Christians who die before the Second Coming?" Then we must ask in what circumstances such a question would be most likely to be asked, and surely the answer is that it would be when the Thessalonians had been told by Paul that the Parousia, which they were so eagerly expecting, would be deferred to the indefinite future. But this is precisely what is done in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12. The situation may be reconstructed thus.

There is at Thessalonica a young and enthusiastic community living in daily expectation of the dawning of the day of the Lord. They are being persecuted by enemies outside and troubled by eccentrics within. The question soon comes to be why the Parousia does not happen, and that carries with it the danger that being disappointed on this head the members will come to think that the whole gospel is a fraud or a delusion. The delay of the Parousia threatens the very existence of the community.

The statement in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12 meets this danger by saying what the "Little Apocalypse" in Mark xiii says: οὐπω τὸ τέλος—"the end is not yet"¹. Before the Parousia there will be one last convulsive effort of the kingdom of Satan to assert

¹ Mark xiii. 7.

itself in the world : there will be a Satanic parousia, which will be tricked out with bogus signs and wonders and will lead many people astray. Then, and not till then, the genuine Parousia will take place and the power of evil be finally destroyed.

This answer, if accepted, clearly resolves the difficulties created by the delay of the Parousia ; but it does so at the price of raising new questions. Among them is the question, " What about the brethren who may never live to see the delayed Parousia? Where is their share in the good time that is coming? " This question is answered in 1 Thess. iv. 13-18. Those who have died in faith before the Parousia will be raised from the dead to share in it along with those who are still alive. Read in this way and in this order the two passages make perfect sense and illuminate one another.

(c) The third section¹ is headed " Concerning the times and the seasons ". Here again it is possible to frame the kind of question to which the statements in the section give an answer. And it is another supplementary question which would naturally arise out of the teaching on the delayed Parousia given in 2 Thess. A community waiting for an imminent Parousia is not greatly concerned about premonitory signs : it is the thing itself that is looked for. But if the thing itself is postponed and the watchers are told to expect something else first, then they are likely to ask for further details. The natural retort to " the end is not yet " is " how long then? " " What will be the signs that events are beginning to march, and when may we expect to see them? " Paul's answer is that no time-table can be drawn up. " The Lord will come like a thief in the night." ² This also favours the hypothesis that 2 Thess. preceded 1 Thess.

If this conclusion is well established we may reconstruct the order of events somewhat as follows.

A.D. 49 Paul sets out on the second missionary campaign, in the course of which he crosses from Asia Minor into Macedonia and there founds churches, including one at Thessalonica. After leaving the city he comes to Beroea and later goes on to Athens.

¹ 1 Thess. v. 1-11.

² 1 Thess. v. 2. This is the Q teaching on the final consummation, on which see my book *The Sayings of Jesus* (1949), pp. 114-48.

From Athens he sends word to Silas and Timothy to join him there. Later they arrive, probably bringing news of the trials and problems at Thessalonica, which they would no doubt have heard of at Beroea. They may even have brought a letter from the Thessalonian church to Paul, though we have no positive evidence for this. From Athens Timothy is sent to Thessalonica bearing 2 Thess. What Silas does at this juncture is unknown. All we know is that Paul went from Athens to Corinth alone.

Winter 49/50 Paul arrives in Corinth from Athens. Later he is joined by Silas and Timothy, the latter bringing a report on conditions at Thessalonica and a number of questions raised in the minds of the Thessalonian Christians by the message of 2 Thess. Paul then sends 1 Thess., partly to express his joy at the good news brought by Timothy and partly to deal with the questions that had been put to him. This letter should perhaps be dated early in A.D. 50.¹

¹ The question may be asked, why if 2 Thess. 1 Thess. is the correct order, the two letters appear in the order 1 Thess. 2 Thess. in the New Testament. The most probable answer is in one word—size. There seems to be a tendency to put the longest letters first in the Pauline corpus.

THE ORIGIN OF THE JANISSARIES

By J. A. B. PALMER, B.A.

THE account which von Hammer gave of the origin of the Janissaries was accepted and followed by subsequent writers from the eighteen twenties to the nineteen twenties.¹ Then its authority began to be shaken, particularly by an article published by F. Giese in 1924, in which he gave the extracts from the chronicle of 'Āshiqpashazāde relative to the origin of the Janissaries.² Giese based his revised narrative only on those extracts: he himself was already editing a text of the Anonymous Chronicle (to be mentioned presently) and was presently to re-edit the text of 'Āshiqpashazāde, while a few years later Babinger was to discover and edit the text of the chronicle of Uruj. One reason why Giese's article cannot be treated as definitive is that these other texts were not then equally available. There has been further discussion and the latest writers on the subject, Professor H. A. R. Gibb and Mr. H. Bowen, pronounce the origin of the Janissaries as still uncertain.³

This uncertainty can be removed, I believe, by a fresh investigation of the sources, taking them in their due order and considering their inter-relationship. The earliest sources are three Turkish chronicles, composed in the fifteenth century but comprising fourteenth century material. There are slight discrepancies between one of these and the other two in the passages relevant to our purpose, but these can be explained, and the three chronicles together give us a clear and self-consistent account of the matter, an account which I shall call the *Chroniclars' Narrative*. It has been already noticed by several writers

¹ Josef von Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 2te Ausgabe, Pesth. (i) (1834), 92-100, 148-9.

² F. Giese, *Das Problem der Entstehung des osmanischen Reiches*. Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft: Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete, ii (1924), 246-71.

³ H. A. R. Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West* (1950), p. 58.

that the Chroniclers' Narrative contains no reference to the *devshirme* or tribute of Christian children, and it is now generally recognized that this was not part of the original institution. Our next set of sources consists of two Latin writers of the mid-fifteenth century, the Franciscan Fr. Bartholomaeus de Jano and the Dominican Fr. Georgius de Hungaria, who establish the date of the introduction of the *devshirme*. Next, in the first decade of the sixteenth century, we have to consider the account to be found in the *Hasht Bihisht* of Idris al-Bitlisi, which at the end of the sixteenth century was adopted by the two most famous of Ottoman historians, Sa'd ad-dīn and 'Ālī; this account, which I shall call the Idrisian Version, is the main cause of confusion because, while it is really based on the Chroniclers' Narrative, it introduces certain re-arrangements of that material which have misled subsequent writers. The confusion was further increased in the sixteenth century and subsequently by the circulation of some quite legendary stories, which I shall call the Bektashī Legends, concerning the connection of Hāji Bektash, the founder or eponym of the Bektashī Dervishes, with the origin of the Janissaries. By the end of the seventeenth century, through translations or oral transmission, scholars in Europe had in front of them the Chroniclers' Narrative, the Idrisian Version, and the Bektashī Legends; the uncritical mingling of these three sources brought confusion and uncertainty into the pages of European scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and even into those of d'Ohsson and von Hammer who, however, mainly accepted (and imposed on their successors) the Idrisian Version, instead of the Chroniclers' Narrative.

I shall now attempt to amplify and justify this summary statement of the sources and their inter-relationship, and I hope in this way to show what are the true facts (so far as we have record of them) concerning the origin of the Janissaries.

(i) *The Chroniclers' Narrative:* (a) *The White Caps*

There are three chronicles to be taken into account, namely, (a) the Chronicle of Uruj, (b) the Anonymous Chronicle passing under the title of Ta'rikh-i-al-i-'Othmān, and (c) the Chronicle

of 'Āshiqpashazāde. There is a statement in 'Āshiqpashazāde that he derived his narrative of the early reigns down to Bayezid I from the work of a certain Yakhshi Faqīh, the son of a certain Ishāq, who had been an *imām* of Orkhan. All three of our chronicles agree closely, and they seem to go back to the same source, viz. Yakhshi. He was alive in 1413, when 'Āshiqpashazāde was in personal contact with him. Thus, Yakhshi must have been born not later than the beginning of the reign of Murad I (1359), and his father had been a man of standing under Orkhan. Consequently, what our chronicles take from Yakhshi, that is to say, the portions down to c. 1420 including their accounts of the origins of the Janissaries, comprises traditions recorded by Yakhshi at the beginning of the fifteenth century as to events of the previous century falling within his own lifetime or the lifetime of his father.¹

The Chronicle of Uruj has been identified, so far, in two manuscripts, one at Oxford and one at Cambridge, of which the latter is undoubtedly an abbreviation of a fuller text represented by the former.² The Anonymous Chronicle survives in numerous copies, which have been carried on by different

¹ These chronicles are now available in printed editions with introductions, and in one case a translation as follows :

Uruj. Franz Babinger, *Die frühosmanische Jahrbücher des Urudsch usw.* (Hannover, 1925).

The Anonymous Chronicle. Friedrich Giese, *Die altosmanische anonyme Chroniken*, Teil I, Text und Variantenverzeichnis (Breslau, 1922); Teil II, Übersetzung in *Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. xvii, nr. 1 (Leipzig, 1925); Teil III, Einleitung in *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, Bd. i (Wien, 1922).

'Āshiqpashazāde. *Die altosmanische Chronik des Aşikpaşazade*, Friedrich Giese (Leipzig, 1929).

References will be to these editions.

For further biographical and bibliographical information concerning these writers and their works (including Yakhshi Faqīh) see F. Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen* (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 10, 23, 35 ff., 39 ff., 73 ff.

² The Oxford MS. ends in A.H. 872, the Cambridge MS. has been continued to A.H. 899, but over their common extent the latter is much shorter than the former and the effect of abbreviation is noticeable in many passages. There are, however, curious and fairly consistent differences of orthography and phraseology which seem to indicate derivation from a common original, not one text from the other, as they now exist. In the next note, we shall see that our Oxford MS. can hardly be the original text of Uruj.

continuator to greatly varying dates : in its original form it seems to be closely related to *Uruj*, but to contain much additional matter : it was re-edited and republished in a shorter recension by a Turkish writer of the mid-sixteenth century.¹

'*Āshiqpashazāde* is distinctly more literary and artificial than the other two chronicles, interposing chapter headings and notes, adding at the end biographical notices, and using a less primitive and plain language. It is considered that in the form in which we now possess them *Uruj* dates from 1460-70 and the other two from c. 1490.

As regards the passages with which we shall be concerned, the Oxford MS. of *Uruj* is to be preferred to the Cambridge MS., while the Anonymous Chronicle is in such very close agreement with *Uruj* that it would be a waste of space to set out the text of both. '*Āshiqpashazāde*, however, while agreeing in general with *Uruj*, has differences of detail which need examination. Hence I propose to give in translation the relevant passages from *Uruj* (Oxford MS.) and '*Āshiqpashazāde* : the latter are already available in Giese's article, but it is the narrative of *Uruj*, supported by the Anonymous Chronicle, which is really fundamental and which it is essential to compare with '*Āshiqpashazāde*. The passages to be considered are two in number.²

¹ In his introduction to his edition of *Uruj*, Babinger surmises with great probability that some of the manuscripts used by Giese in preparing his edition of the Anonymous Chronicle were really texts of *Uruj*. The following is also worthy of note. At the end of the reign of 'Othmān, *Uruj* says that he ruled for nineteen years and for the remainder of his life entrusted the chieftainship to Orkhan, while the Anonymous Chronicle merely says that 'Othmān reigned for nineteen years and no more. Both, of course, are wrong, even by the dates which they themselves have earlier given. A copyist has confused *otuz dokuz* (thirty-nine) with *ondokuz* (nineteen), which could easily happen in Arabic script. It follows that a common ancestor in which this corruption had already occurred underlies both our Oxford MS. of *Uruj* and the manuscript or manuscripts of the Anonymous Chronicle which Giese is following here : moreover, a later and stupid editor or copyist of our text of *Uruj* has added an inept and false explanation, to reconcile the discrepancy in the dates.

² This brief review of the relationship of the chronicles, as also of the dates of composition, rests upon the introductions of their respective editors, coupled with my own observations, as appears in the preceding notes.

The first passage is to be found in the reign of Orkhan, and is as follows :

Uruj (Oxford MS.)¹

His [sc. Orkhan's] brother 'Ali Pasha also abandoned the Beglik and handed it over to Orkhan.² He himself, embracing the way of the Shaikhs became a dervish. One day 'Ali Pasha said to his brother Orkhan " Oh ! brother, praise be to Allah, now again thy army has increased, the army of Islam has become strong, the army of Muhammad has attained majesty in the eyes of all and from day to day has increased. Now do thou also make in face of the world a formal act that thereby it be known in the world." Orkhan Ghāzī said " Oh ! brother, whatever thou sayest, do, so be it ! " 'Ali Pasha said " Oh ! brother, let all thy army put on a red cap : put thou on thyself a white cap and let thy dependent slaves put on a white cap : let this be a sign in the face of the world." Orkhan Ghāzī accepted this word. He sent some one and obtained authority in Amasia from Hāji Bektash of Khorāsān (Allah have mercy on him !) and had a white cap brought. He first put it on himself and afterwards his dependent slaves put on the white cap. The wearing of the white cap has remained from that time. At that time the kings and chiefs were in accord with their brothers, they respected and honoured each other, they used not to kill each other down to the time of Yildirim Khān ; afterwards, in the time of Khān Yildirim, the killing of brother by brother came in. And in Anatolia in the time of Orkhan Ghāzī there came in the enrolment of *yaya* [foot soldiers].

'Āshiqpashazāde

His brother 'Alā ad-dīn Pasha³ said to Orkhan Ghāzī, " My Khān, praise be to Allah that I have seen thee as king. Now also together thy army should increase from day to day. Now also put a sign on thy soldiery, which is not upon other soldiery." Orkhan Ghāzī said, " My brother, I accept whatever thou sayest." He said, " Now the caps of the Begs round about are red, let thine be white." He said " So be it." In Bilejik they set up the white cap : Orkhan Ghāzī put it on, all those subject to him put it on together. Orkhan sought to increase his army, as much as he could from that country. His brother said " it is a matter for the Qādis." At that time Chendereli Karaja Khalil was Qādī of Bilejik, and he was of the family of Edebali. He was informed and said " Get foot soldiers from the district [or the people—the word is *il*]." Thereupon a lot of men offered bribes to the Qādī saying " Get me enrolled as a foot soldier." And they made them also wear the white cap.

¹ P. 15 of Babinger's edition of Uruj : the following passage from 'Āshiqpashazāde is on p. 37 of F. Giese's edition.

² The Oxford MS. has *Beglerbeglik*, the Cambridge MS. *Beglik*. The latter is correct, being the old expression for the office of the Ottoman chieftain. The Oxford MS. has again been ineptly amended to convert an obsolete expression into an office (of *Beylerbey*) which existed later.

³ He is usually so called, but Uruj calls him 'Ali : but the latter name can be used for a person whose true name is 'Alā ad-dīn.

Before commenting in detail on these passages it will be helpful to recall the general condition of Ottoman military forces at that time, particularly as reflected in our chronicles. The chronic warfare in Asia Minor along the frontiers of the Christian and Turkish dominions was an affair of frontier raids and counter-raids. In Lascarid times, in Phrygia, these raids were from the Turkish side carried on by people described sometimes as Uj-Turcomans, that is to say, "frontier Turcomans", between whom and the Turks of the Seljuk realm proper, some distinction is drawn.¹ One hundred years later, when a similar frontier in Mysia and Bithynia was the scene of Ottoman raiding, the main mass of Ottoman warriors, corresponding no doubt to the Uj-Turcomans, were designated in the chronicles by the term *ghāzīs*.² This is, of course, a term of general significance, meaning roughly "fighters for the faith". It is now rather generally asserted that the term has also a specialized meaning, and that precisely in early Ottoman times it denotes a body of fighters with some kind of organization, of the nature of a military order, and enjoying support from another organization somewhat resembling a guild of which the members were known as *Ahīs*. Whether there is adequate evidence to support this theory or not is a question which is not material to the problems before us: the Chroniclers' Narrative of the origin of the Janissaries is in no way affected by the meaning which it may be legitimate to attribute to the term *ghāzī* in the chronicles.³ When, as a result of the raids, adjoining districts were wrested from Christian and subjected to Ottoman control, they began almost at once to be divided up among the

¹ Cf. P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche*, pp. 1-5, and Alice Gardiner, *The Lascarids of Nicaea*, p. 223 (as to the capture of Michael Palaeologus by Turcomans).

² It will be found in the texts of the chronicles *passim*.

³ Apart from Giese's article and the work of Gibb and Bowen above-mentioned, see on the question of the *ghāzīs* and the *Ahīs*, particularly P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1938). There is also an article, prior to Wittek's later work, by Langer and Blake, "The Rise of the Ottoman Turks and its Historical Background" in *American Historical Review*, vol. xxxvii, pp. 468 ff.: these writers in that article undervalue the chronicles as historical sources, though admitting that they contain valuable traditions, among which, of course, their account of the origin of the Janissaries can safely be reckoned.

Ottoman warriors, presumably among the principal *ghāzī* heroes or leaders, in a form of ownership or tenure having feudal characteristics the units of which were known as *tīmārs*. The chronicles expressly mention the fact of division as *tīmārs*, both under 'Othmān and under Orkhan.¹ Thus, at the time of the incident described in the above passage, the Ottoman fighting forces consisted of a general body of warriors known as *ghāzīs*, who operated in some kind of unity under the Ottoman Beg, as he was then entitled, but evidently with a good deal of independence in the cases where we hear of named heroes conquering particular districts : and the subjugated territories were divided up, or were possessed by their individual conquerors, on a basis which furnishes the beginnings of a feudal levy consisting of the *tīmār*-holders (*tīmār-erleri* in the chronicles, *tīmār-sipāhīler* in later times) and their retainers.

The passage now under consideration introduces us to two further elements of military organization, namely (i) the dependent slaves of the Beg, and (ii) the *yaya* or footsoldiers. This passage occurs in the reign of Orkhan, near the beginning of the narrative of that reign as it stands in the chronicles, but following upon their mention of the capture of Nicomedia (Ismid), for which the chronicles give no date : Orkhan's reign began in 1327, but from other sources the capture of Nicomedia is held to have occurred about 1338. Hence we can only judge that this incident is to be located rather before 1340.

We see that at this date the Ottoman Beg had a body of dependent slaves who engaged in warlike duties. We need not feel any doubt about this, nor does the origin of such a body require to be explained on the ground of Ottoman mentality or characteristics or any other extraordinary factor. This body was evidently a slave-bodyguard or a slave-household with military functions such as was then common among Moslem rulers : it was over four hundred years since this institution of a Mamlūk household force had been invented by an Arab Caliph and the greatest of contemporary Moslem states, Mamlūk Egypt, was founded upon it. It would be a matter of course for

¹ Uruj, pp. 12, 15 ; Anonymous Chronicle, pp. 7, 14 ; 'Ashiqpashazāde, p. 22.



GENTILE BELLINI: A TURKISH JANISSARY

(By kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum)

To face page 455

a rising Moslem chieftain, such as the Ottoman Beg, to acquire such a body of personal retainers. Whether in this case the source of recruitment was capture in war or purchase from slave-merchants, particularly the Genoese, whose cargoes from the Crimea to Alexandria passed through the Straits, is not clear, but the point is immaterial for our purpose.

The incident which our passage records is the institution of a distinguishing head-dress for this force. The head-dress was a white cap, in Turkish *ak börk*, and there is no doubt that it is the head-dress later worn by the Janissaries, which Latin writers call *mitra* or *pileus*. It was a conical cap of white felt, stiff enough to stand up a few inches above the crown of the head, but so long that the upper part then bent back and fell down behind over the nape of the neck. Its form is beautifully recorded for us in Gentile Bellini's drawing of a Janissary made in 1480-1, now in the British Museum (see plate).

It will have been noticed that, in two particulars concerning the adoption of this head-dress, the accounts of Uruj and 'Āshiqpashazāde differ, namely, as to whether it distinguished the Beg's slave-troops from the rest of the Ottoman forces (Uruj), or from the forces of neighbouring Beks ('Āshiqpashazāde), and as to whether sanction for its use was obtained from a Dervish *Shaikh* (Uruj) or not ('Āshiqpashazāde). On both these points 'Āshiqpashazāde was followed by Giese, and other writers have repeated this view: but Giese had not the text of Uruj before him in 1924, and these seem to be strong reasons for preferring the account of Uruj in both these particulars.¹

First, as to the distinction which the white cap was intended to effect, the account of Uruj is to be preferred as the *difficilior lectio*. If the original distinction was, as 'Āshiqpashazāde says, between the Ottoman troops and those of other Beks, it is very

¹ Giese again stated his preference for 'Āshiqpashazāde on the object of the head-dress (distinction from the forces of neighbouring Beks) in a footnote on p. 22 of his translation of the Anonymous Chronicle, which (as usually) accords with Uruj, and says the distinction was between the household slaves and the other Ottoman troops: Giese conjectures that a sentence has fallen out of the Anonymous Chronicle, but he is still writing before the identification of the text of Uruj, and if he had known that that text agreed with the Anonymous Chronicle and against 'Āshiqpashazāde he would surely have revised his opinion.

difficult to imagine how in the text of *Uruj* this became altered at some time into a distinction between the slave-troops and the rest of the Ottoman forces: if *Uruj*'s distinction, however, is original, it is not difficult to suppose that 'Āshiqpashazāde might have amended it into a more obvious distinction, to his mind and in his time, between Ottoman and non-Ottoman forces. Moreover, if 'Āshiqpashazāde is correct as to this distinction, what he says in his last sentence about the *yaya* is redundant: if all Ottoman forces wore the white cap, then there was no need to mention that the *yaya* wore it. The point of this reference to the head-dress of the *yaya* must have been to equate them with the slave-troops and stress their special connection with the Beg, and it thus implies *Uruj*'s distinction between slave-troops and the other Ottoman forces rather than 'Āshiqpashazāde's own distinction between Ottoman and non-Ottoman forces. Therefore *Uruj* is here to be preferred to 'Āshiqpashazāde.

Secondly, as to Dervish sanction for the head-dress, there are, it must be submitted, good reasons for again following *Uruj*. It must, of course, be conceded that the personal reference to Hāji Bektash is an anachronism, for that individual certainly died in the thirteenth century.¹ If, however, it is taken as a reference to the *Shaikh* of a Bektashi Tekke in Amasia, there is nothing improbable about it, and it is quite in the habits of the time.

The real ground on which scholars have questioned this incident is that the Bektashi Dervishes did in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries undoubtedly make strenuous efforts to nourish a belief in a special connection between their Order and the Janissaries: consequently, this passage has been, and can be, regarded as an interpolation made in favour of this later Bektashi propaganda. There are, however, two reasons against regarding it as such an interpolation. The first is that it does not in any way correspond with the real Bektashi legends, of which, as we shall see, we know both the earlier and later forms. Secondly, it is difficult to believe that a Bektashi interpolator

¹ The most recent and convenient study of the Bektashi Dervishes and their founder is J. K. Birge, *The Bektāṣi Order of Dervishes* (London, 1937).

would have been so ingenious as to insert his false statement in this passage: he would have inserted something in the later passage (to which we shall come) where the Janissaries and their creation are expressly mentioned and not in this passage which does not refer to the Janissaries at all.

One cannot, therefore, fairly regard this item in the narrative of Uruj as a Bektāshī interpolation, and so it must be taken as belonging to the original tradition. If it is then asked why it does not appear in 'Āshiqpashazāde, the answer is that he excised it because he was himself a disbeliever in the Bektāshī claims and hostile to them. The Bektāshī propaganda evidently began to make its way in the second half of the fifteenth century, and it aroused contradiction and hostility. In another passage 'Āshiqpashazāde aligns himself with the latter opinion and characterises the Bektāshī claim that the Janissaries took their head-dress from them as a lie.¹ This opinion of his explains why the reference to Hāji Bektāsh disappears from his account of the matter. The upshot is that, disregarding the anachronism of the personal intervention of Hāji Bektāsh, there is no ground for rejecting the narrative of Uruj, which is in all respects reproduced in the Anonymous Chronicle, as to some original Dervish sanction for the use of the head-dress. It is to be noted also that the head-dress in question does closely resemble the earliest Bektāshī head-dress known as the *elifi tāj*:² but it also corresponds to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's description of the head-dress worn by the *Aḥīs*.

In this passage the term for the dependent slaves is *kullari*, sing. *kul*. They evidently reappear in later passages in the chronicles under the terms *Qapu Kullari*, i.e. Gate-slaves or Court-slaves, and more frequently *Qapu Khalqi*, i.e. Gate-people or Court-people. Under this name they appear at the battles of Ankara and Varna and in many other passages. They are always mentioned together with, but separately from, the Janissaries. Both *Qapu Khalqi* and Janissaries are in close attendance on the Sultan, but the chronicles designate them separately. Later, the term *Qapu Kullari* came to be used as a

¹ 'Āshiqpashazāde, p. 201.

² J. K. Birge, op. cit. Illustration no. 26.

general designation for all the forces or formations, of technically servile status, dependent on the Sultan, including both the various bodies of palace retainers as then existing and also the Janissaries: but originally, as found in the chronicles, the distinction between *Qapu Khalqi* and Janissaries is clear and well maintained.

It is evidently the expression *Qapu Khalqi* from which are derived the expressions *πόρτα*, *θύρα* and *θύραι* which appear in Byzantine historians. It cannot, therefore, be said that these expressions necessarily refer to the Janissaries, as, for instance, when Ducas mentions the *πόρτα* as present at the battle of Nicopolis. No doubt, the Byzantine writers may not have been aware of any distinction between *Qapu Khalqi* and Janissaries: but, strictly speaking, we should think of the *Qapu Khalqi*, the Beg's dependent household bodyguard, and not the Janissaries, when the term *πόρτα* or *θύρα* is used in a fifteenth century Greek text.

It remains to consider the force raised under the name of *yaya* or footsoldiers, as mentioned at the end of the passage now under consideration. The date of this experiment is not indicated. It is a separate matter from the incident of the white cap, and we may reasonably surmise that it belongs to the period after 1340, and very possibly after 1350. It evidently represents an attempt to increase the forces in close dependence on the Beg, as distinct from the loosely organized *ghāzīs* and the feudal levy of the *tīmār*-holders; 'Āshiqpashazāde says as much. Whether the originator of the project was Chendereli Kara Khalīl Pasha (later Khair ad-dīn Pasha), as 'Āshiqpashazāde tells us, is not certain. That personage, as we shall see, was certainly concerned with the creation of the Janissaries, and it may be by reflection from that fact that 'Āshiqpashazāde brings him in here: on the other hand, if he was concerned with the unsuccessful experiment of the *yaya*, that could explain why he was led to seek a fresh and successful solution of the same problem through the creation of the Janissaries.

The Chroniclers' Narrative in these passages does not explain the basis on which the *yaya* were raised. The view most recently expressed is that they were originally given grants of

land.¹ This view, however, is contrary to the earliest account of this aspect of the matter which we possess, namely, the *Hasht Bihisht*. As mentioned, the author of this work remoulded the Chroniclers' Narrative in regard to the Janissaries, but as regards the organization of the *yaya* he is our earliest authority, and (as will appear below) he clearly states that the *yaya* were originally a force who received pay while on campaign and certain tax exemptions: it was only later, when they had proved a failure, that they were given auxiliary functions and received grants of land in place of their original conditions.

The explanation for the failure of the *yaya* is to be gained from the statement of 'Āshiqpashazāde regarding bribery to obtain this status, and this accords very well with the supposition that they were originally paid troops. Pay for military service was a novelty, and there would naturally be a rush to take advantage of it. Now, the offer was made to the population of the Anatolian districts. This, however, was the same population from which came the *ghāzīs*, whose services to the Beg were free, and from which the *tīmār*-holders drew their retainers and also their force of cultivators. Hence in offering pay for military service to this population the Beg was competing with himself and also with the *tīmār*-holders. That is why this experiment was a failure.

However, the *yaya*, though not successful as an expansion of the Beg's personal troops, do not entirely disappear. They were formed at sometime in Rumili, as well as Anatolia. According to the chronicles, *yaya* from Anatolia and 'azabs from Rumili, mentioned together and evidently similar in character, were present at Kossovo I in 1389: it is extraordinary that neither *Qapu Khalqī* nor Janissaries are mentioned by the chronicles as present at that battle. The chronicles also mention that in the rebellion of the false Mustafa at the beginning of the reign of Murad II, the Rumili *yaya* were converted into *Musellem* while Chalcocondylas mentions the *yaya* taking part in Murad II's attack on the Isthmus of Corinth.² The fore-

¹ Gibb and Bowen, op. cit., p. 54.

² Under the name *αγιάδες*: the word was identified by R. P. Blake in his review in *Speculum* (1948), p. 138, of Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*.

going is the earliest reference to *Musellem*, a cavalry force which received pay or land-grants similar to the *yaya*. It is a coherent story if we regard the *Musellem* as mounted *yaya* and as subsequent in date to the *yaya*, as the chronicles here show. Some connection or similarity between *yaya* and 'azabs is also to be suspected. Petantius mentions that the 'azabs wore red caps early in the sixteenth century.

To sum up the Chroniclers' Narrative so far, Orkhan, on the suggestion of his brother, about 1340 adopted a distinctive head-dress for his soldiers, consisting of a white cap for his own slave-bodyguard, and (probably) a red cap for the rest of his troops: sanction for the use of the white cap was obtained from Dervish quarters. Later, after 1340, and perhaps after 1350, an attempt was made to increase his personal forces by recruiting a (paid) infantry force, known as *yaya*, from Anatolia, but this experiment failed for reasons which we can easily discern.

(ii) *The Chroniclers' Narrative continued: (b) The creation of the Janissaries*

The second passage with which we are concerned occurs in the reign of Murad I, and is as follows:

Uruj (Oxford MS)¹

Again he [sc. Murad I] sent Lala Shāhin to Zagora and Philippopolis. He gave him a raid. The *ghāzīs* conquered that part, and when Evrenos Beg had also conquered the part round Ipsala, each one of those Begs became in his own place an Uj-Beg. Finally they conquered Ipsala. It was in the year of the Hijra 763. And there was a *dānishmand* called Kara Rustem; he had come from Karaman. He came to Chendereli Kara K̄halil who was Qāḍī 'asker. He said to him, "My lord, as to this booty which there is, coming from the raid, why dost thou not seize it for the chieftainship? Thou art causing loss." The Qāḍī 'asker said, "Indeed! What should we do?" Kara Rustem said, "These prisoners that the *ghāzīs* bring, according to the commandment of God one-fifth should go to the king: why dost thou not take it?" The Qāḍī 'asker said to Murad K̄hān Ghāzī, "Oh! king, since it is the commandment of God, why shouldst thou not take it?" Said he "Take", and so gave command. They went and put Kara Rustem over the *Aķinjis*. "Since it is the commandment of God, so be it", they said. Kara Rustem set himself at Gallipoli. He took 25 *aķches* per prisoner. This innovation was through these two persons. They charged Evrenos Beg also that he should take 25 *aķches* per prisoner coming from a raid,

¹ P. 21.

and one prisoner out of five. Thus they arranged it and carried it out. They collected the youths and divided them among the Turkish folk in Anatolia : they set them to ploughing and to menial tasks, and they learnt Turkish. After three or four years had passed, they brought them back and made them at the Court into *Yenicheri*, and made them wear the white cap. This was the original foundation of the *Yenicheri* : since that time they gave them the name *Yenicheri*.

‘*Āshiqpashazāde*’¹

The *Khān* stayed in state in Adrianople. He gave a raid to his Lala to the parts round Zagora and to Philippopolis. Evrenos *Ghāzī* also went, he conquered Ipsala. These became Uj-Begs each in his own place. One day a *dānishmand* they called Kara Rustem came from the Karaman country : he came to Chendereli Kara *Khalīl*, who was *Qāḍī* ‘asker : he said, “ Sir, why dost thou cause loss of this property ? ” The *Qāḍī* said, “ What is this property ? ” Rustem said “ These prisoners which these *ghāzīs* take, by the command of God one in five of them belongs to the *Khān* : why dost thou not take ? ” The *Qāḍī* ‘asker submitted it to the *Khān*. They called Kara Rustem and said, “ My lord, whatever is the command of God, do.” He set himself in Gallipoli : he took 25 *akches* per prisoner, and this innovation was the work of two *dānishmands*, one Chendereli Kara *Khalīl*, and the other Kara Rustem. And also they charged *Ghāzī* Evrenos, they said, “ Take one in five of the prisoners coming from the raid, and from him who has not five prisoners take his 25 *akches* per prisoner ” : and over this arrangement Evrenos also set a *Qāḍī*. And many youths were collected, they brought them to the *Khān*. *Khalīl* said, “ Let us give these to the Turks, let them learn Turkish, let us make them into a force of troops,” thus said he, and thus it was. Day by day, there were more : in the end they became Moslems, they made use of them for some years, afterwards they brought them to the Court, they put on them a cap, they gave them the name of *Yenicheri*, they exist at the present time.

This incident is narrated directly after the story of the capture of Adrianople, which the chronicles date in 761/1360, while the present story follows on fresh raids dated 763/1362. Whether these dates are correct cannot here be discussed. The *ghāzīs* are still the main personnel of the Turkish forces, but their operations seem to be more organized : this is to be gathered from the fact that they operate under leaders belonging to the entourage of the Beg, who is said to “ give the raid ” to the chosen commander. The word used for raid is *akın*, and the *ghāzīs* participating in the raid are called *Akīnjis*, the name of terror by which the irregular troops of the Ottoman rulers became known to the inhabitants of the Balkans,

¹ P. 50.

Hungary, Transylvania and Slavonia.¹ We can thus see that the later *Akinjis*, who now first appear, are the old *ghāzīs*. The term *ghāzīs* when used in the later parts of the chronicles certainly has merely its general sense: the raiding forces, when the frontier is in the Balkans or on the Danube and the regular Ottoman forces have been fully organized, are the *Akinjis*. At the present stage the *Akinji* commanders are given some special status in the frontier districts under the title of *Uj-begs*, frontier-chiefs, reminiscent of the Uj-Turcomans. This title persists quite late in the chronicles: they are found along the Danube in the reign of Murad II, always in connection with the *Akinjis*.²

The origin of the Janissary organization is to be found in a suggestion by a certain Kara Rustem to apply the ordinary Moslem law of *ghanimat* (booty) to human captives. This law provided that one-fifth of all booty should belong to Allah, i.e. to the public fisc. If this is applied to living creatures it can only operate in kind where a captor is bringing in a group of at least five captives, when one can be taken by the fisc and four be left to the captor. To deal with fractional groups below five or between two multiples of five, a value per head must be set on the creatures in question and then for each individual in the fractional group the captor pays one-fifth of that value. That is what was done here. The value fixed for a captive was 125 *akches* (or aspers), and for a "fractional" captive the captor paid 25 *akches*. Thus the captor of five prisoners yielded up one, the captor of nine prisoners yielded one prisoner and 100 (4×25) *akches*, and so on.

The collection of this levy was entrusted to Kara Rustem at Gallipoli when the prisoners would be brought down for transport to Anatolia, and also to Evrenos Beg because he was the Uj-Beg through whose control the returning raiders would pass with their booty.

Chendereli Kara Khalil suggested that the prisoners who were thus collected (the verb used here is *devshirmek*) should be utilized for the formation of a New Force (*Yenicheri*) of

¹ For a remarkable description of the *Akinjis* c. 1450, their training and methods, see Fr. Georgius de Hungaria, O.P., *Tractatus de moribus, condicionibus et nequicia Turcorum*, cap. v.

² See, for instance, Uruj. p. 60.

slave troops. By this method the ruler's personal force could be increased without incurring the defects disclosed in the *yaya* experiment. The Turkish word *cheri* means an army, a military force, or troops. It is used in the chronicles interchangeably with the Persian word *lashkar*: sometimes both words are used in the same sentence with the same meaning, and both are applied to Ottoman forces, to enemy forces, and to allied forces.¹ Later in the chronicles both words also acquire a specialized meaning as the technical terms for the feudal levies of Anatolia and Rumili respectively, commanded by the Beglerbegs. *Yenicheri* means simply New Force.

The cash levy or commutation for fractional prisoners was originally a levy made by the fisc from the captor. It later turned into a due which was exacted by a Moslem landholder, whose position would be that of a quasi-captor, from his Christian tenants, regarded here as quasi-captives. This transformation had come about at least as early as the reign of Murad II, for this due is mentioned in law-books dating from the reign of Mehmed II.² It is found again in various localities in the codes of Sulaiman I in the mid-sixteenth century: it remained in existence and was noted by d'Ohsson and by von Hammer as a poll-tax.³ In this altered form, the levy was known as *penjik*, a Persian word for one-fifth, corrupted into *ispenje*: it always retained the original fractional figure of 25 *akches* per head. How this transformation came about, we cannot at present say, but it is clear that the *penjik* tax is a later development from the fractional cash commutation under the old law of *ghanimat*.

To sum up the Chroniclers' Narrative so far as concerns this episode, after the capture of Adrianople and further raids in the Balkans there was a great influx of prisoners and a

¹ Examples may be found in Uruij, pp. 13, 22, 33, 34, 73, etc.

² See *Mitteil. z. osm. Gesch.*, i, 28 (text), 44 (trans.). The code in question regulates the rights of men-at-arms, i.e. the lowest grade of the feudal fighting force who would have been the practical captors on campaign.

³ von Hammer, *Des osm. Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung*, pp. 213, 246, 281 and 291: Mouradja d'Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'Empire Othoman*, iii, 37-8. von Hammer again mentions that it was payable to the immediate lord, i.e. the quasi-captor.

certain Kara Rustem suggested that the public fisc ought, under the law of *ghanimat*, to make a levy of one prisoner in five. This was done. Chendereli Kara *Khalil* suggested that the prisoners so collected should be used to create a New Force of slave-retainers for the Beg, known therefore as *Yenicheri*: these were given the same white cap as the pre-existing *Qapu Khalqi*. The application of the law of *ghanimat* involved a cash commutation at 25 *akches* per head for fractional groups of captives. Later on this became transformed into a tax known as *penjik* or *ispenje*, levied from Christian tenants by their Moslem lords.

(iii) *The Devshirme*

The Chroniclers' Narrative shows that neither the *Qapu Khalqi* nor the Janissaries were originally recruited by means of the forced levy of Christian children later known as the *devshirme*, the verbal noun of the same verb which the Chroniclers' Narrative uses for the "collection" of the captives taken by the fisc. For the origin of the *devshirme* we have to utilize the information contained in two Latin writers.

The first of these is a Franciscan friar, Fr. Bartholomaeus de Jano. In his *Epistole de Crudelitate Turcarum*, dated from Constantinople in December 1438, he gives a long and harrowing description of the devastation caused by the Ottomans (including a reference to the very raid into Siebenbürgen in August 1438 in which Fr. Georgius de Hungaria was captured), the sufferings of Christian captives, and the iniquities of Christian slave-dealers. He then gives a warning that Murad II is preparing an attack on Constantinople for the following year and has recruited 3000 rowers and collected materials of war. He next proceeds as follows:

*Adde, si quid ponderis est, quod de omnibus villis, civitatibus et castellis suo subjectis imperio, quae forte centum millia sunt decimam puerorum partem de Christianis, quod prius numquam fecerat, nuper accepit a decem usque ad viginti aetatis annos, quos suos speciales sclavos et armigeros, et quod pejus est, Saracenos effecit.*¹

¹ Migne, PG. 158, cols. 1055-67: the quotation is from col. 1066. The credit for first noting this statement seems to belong to J. H. Mordtmann in an article in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. *Devshirme*: but he quoted inaccurately and without the necessary context, and failed to give the reference. Fr. Bartholomaeus de Jano is so named from his birthplace, Giano near Spoleto (*Yanensis*

Considering that Fr. Bartholomaeus had only just returned from the Council of Ferrara and that he stresses in his letter the events of that very year 1438, the adverb *nuper* must be emphasised and probably means that the thing happened in 1438 and even perhaps in the later months of the year. The phrase *decimam partem* should be taken rather as tithe in a general sense : the exact proportion need not be pressed. The levy was not, in the writer's eyes, of much military importance (*si quid ponderis est*), and was probably for the *Qapu Khalqi* (*speciales sclavos et armigeros*) rather than for the Janissaries.

Fr. Bartholomaeus does not indicate that the levy was to be regularly repeated : moreover, there is extant another letter from him dated in February 1442 (1443), in which he repeats his descriptions of the sufferings of Christian captives but omits any mention of this levy.¹ Evidence, however, that it was repeated and had become an established institution between 1438 and 1458 is contained in the *Tractatus de moribus, condicionibus et nequicia Turcorum* of Fr. Georgius de Hungaria, a Dominican friar. His most interesting description of the Janissaries, as they existed before the end of his captivity in 1458, has not been printed in modern times.² Therefore, I transcribe it in

Umber, Wadding calls him) : one of the Franciscans specially employed by Pope Eugenius IV in the matter of the re-union, he accompanied the Emperor John VIII to Ferrara, and returned to Constantinople, where he was Vicar of the Province of the Orient with full powers from the Minister General of the Observants, and established a convent, known as S. Antonius de Cipressis, which was destroyed at the Turkish capture. See Wadding, *Annales Minorum* (3rd edn., 1931), vols. x and xi, index s.n., *Bartholomaeus de Yano*.

¹ The second letter is extant in an old French version, contained in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale now numbered Français 1278, which was printed in *Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre par Jehan de Wavrin*, edited by Mlle. Dupont for the *Société de l'Histoire de France*, Tome II, 6ème Partie, Paris, 1859 : the subscription in the manuscript is Berthelemy de Jennes, which the editress made into Barthélemy de Gênes (under which name Zinkeisen later quoted it), a confusion of *Janua* with *Jano*.

² Fr. Georgius de Hungaria, born in Siebenbürgen in 1422, was captured by the Turks at Szászsebes, where he was a student, in a raid in 1438 mentioned curiously enough by Bartholomaeus de Jano : he remained in captivity till 1458, then returned and became a Dominican, arrived in Rome probably between 1475 and 1480 and at about that time wrote his book, which is the most valuable and interesting account extant of Ottoman life and institutions before 1500 and was reprinted in eleven Latin editions between 1480 and 1530, and thereafter in

entirety from the first edition of his work, expanding abbreviations, but otherwise retaining his orthography :—

Praeterea Turcus magnus ab omni prede et rapina decimas suas habet et cum senserit copiam esse captivorum, precepit ut omnes juvenes a xx. annis et infra per partem decime que ad eum spectat sibi offerantur. Sed et per omnem terram sui domini adhuc multi sunt de grecis antiquis et aliis nationibus qui castella et oppida plurima inhabitant et ab omnibus statutis et oneribus aliorum dominorum liberi et exempti ipsius regis serviciis intendunt et ad eius curiam pertinent. Horum filios a xx. annis et infra etatis missis nunciis de quinquennio ad quinquennium sibi adducere precipit et jubet ut, distributi per curias magnatorum suorum, in moribus et viribus et in armis erudiantur et exerceantur. Qui dum circa xx. vel amplius etatis pervenerint reductos ad curiam suam in stipendium suum eos recipit et sibi familiaris facit. Tales eorum lingua gingitscheri vocantur et habentur aliquando in curia regis xxx. vel xl. milia et portant quaedam insignia in vestimentis et maxime in capite portant pileos vel mitras albas, quibus nemo audeat uti nisi sit de curia regis.¹

Apart from its reference to the tribute of children, this passage confirms the Chroniclers' Narrative as to the recruitment from prisoners of war and as to the white caps, points of considerable interest in view of its early date. The statement that the children were levied from Christians who were free of dues to other lords and rendered services to the Sultan himself is also of interest, because it is possibly the explanation of how this institution, totally unjustified by the Sacred Law of Islam, came into being. Other lords were already levying the *penjik* from their tenants, and perhaps the Sultan likewise levied it from his and now claimed it in kind, in its original form : it could then be justified on the ground of custom or analogy, though not by

several imperfect German versions : he died in 1502, and was buried near Fra Angelico in the church of S. Maria sopra Minerva in Rome. For fuller information I may be allowed to refer to an article which I published in the BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, vol. xxxiv, no. 1 (September, 1951), pp. 44ff.

¹ It is the more necessary for me to record that this important reference was noted (but not quoted) by A. H. Lybyer, *Government of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (1913), in an Appendix, pp. 309-10, because in my article referred to above I omitted his name from my list of forty writers who make use of or mention the *Tractatus*. Lybyer, however, was much at sea over the bibliography of the *Tractatus*. He also (glancing no doubt at the *Prologus*) thought the author was only a theological student and further (misled doubtless by the tendentious preface of Martin Luther to the Augsburg 1530 edition) supposed him to have held " some of the ideas that preceded the Reformation ", whatever that may mean : in fact, the author was a Dominican friar and a priest, and we now know that he died in Rome in 1502 in such odour of sanctity that he was venerated by crowds after his death. His pages abundantly show his fervid devotion to the Catholic Church, her full doctrine and authority.

any express permission of the Sacred Law. However, the tribute did not apparently in later times remain confined to the Sultan's own tenants.

To complete the early references to the *devshirme*, it seems to be mentioned in a treaty or capitulation concluded between Mehmed II and the Genoese at Galata in 1453.¹ It seems also to be referred to by Chalcocondylas.² Moreover, Phrantzes states that Murad II first gave to the Janissaries the organization which they had in Phrantzes' time and that previously they had different regulations and uniform, a statement which might refer to the new mode of recruitment.³ Paulus Jovius, c. 1540, says that Murad II first established the Janissaries, a statement which may be based on the passage in Phrantzes.⁴

The original period of the levy's recurrence and the proportion of children taken is uncertain. There is considerable evidence for a period of five years and a proportion of one-fifth, which would tend to confirm some connection with the *ghanimat* law and the *penjik* tax. Fr. Georgius de Hungaria makes it quinquennial.⁵ Spandugino (information first collected c. 1505) says it was every five years and the proportion of the eligible children actually taken was one-fifth.⁶ Petantius (information before 1516) says the levy was triennial or, as some say, quinquennial.⁷ Menavino says the levy was as if by a tithe and from a father who had three children one might be taken.⁸ Geuffroy

¹ Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi*, iii. 287.

² Laonikos Chalcocondylas in *Corpus Script. Hist. Byz.*, Pars xxxi, p. 228.

³ Georgios Phrantzes, op. cit. Pars xxiii, Lib. I, cap. xxxi.

⁴ Paolo Giovio vescovo di Nocera, *Commentario de le cose de' Turchi* (Venice, 1538 ?): see under the reign of Murad II. ⁵ See the quotation above.

⁶ Theodoro Spandugino Cantacuscino, *I Commentari dell'origine de' Principi Turchi e de' costumi di quella nazione* (Florence, 1541), p. 123.

⁷ Felix Petantius' only printed work is his treatise *Quibus itineribus Turci sunt aggrediendi*, but he collected much valuable information when he was in Constantinople as an envoy of Ladislaus II of Hungary before 1516: he was a personal friend of Joannes Cuspinianus, who (according to J. G. Vossius *De Historicis Latinis* (1627), p. 548, (1651), p. 607), possessed an unprinted manuscript of Petantius, and who embodies much information from Petantius in his *De Origine Turcorum* (see p. 475, n. 5 below), where the item now in question is in the section entitled *Militum Genera*.

⁸ Giovantonio Menavino, *I Cinque Libri della Legge, Religione et vita de' Turchi etc.* (Venice, 1548), p. 108.

says it was quadrennial : ¹ Paulus Jovius only mentions recruitment from prisoners of war : ² these last three sources are all about 1540.

(iv) *The Idrisian Version*

Having thus examined and commented on the earliest sources which record the creation of the Janissaries (the chronicles) and of the *devshirme* (the two Latin authors), we now have to consider when and how the Idrisian Version of the story came into being.

The Idrisian Version appears first in the *Hasht Bihisht* of Idris al-Bitlisi, which was composed between 1500 and 1510. The work was written in florid Persian, to the order of the Sultan Bayezid II, who desired a history covering the exploits of the House of Othman to be produced on the model of accepted Arabic and Persian historians.³

At the period when Idris wrote and for at least sixty years thereafter, we find that the chronicles, and the Chroniclers' Narrative as to the Janissaries, are dominant in Ottoman historiography. Thus, Mehmed Neshri virtually reproduced 'Āshiq-pashazāde, in his *Jahānnumā*, which was written before 1520.⁴ Then, about 1550, the Anonymous Chronicle itself was re-edited and republished in a shorter recension by a certain Muḥyi'd-dīn b. 'Alī al-Jamālī.⁵ At about the same time Kūchūk Nishānji Mehmed Pasha gives an abbreviated version of the Chroniclers' Narrative in the corresponding passages of his

¹ F. Antoine Geuffroy, *Briefve descriptiō de la Court du Grant Turc etc.* (Paris, 1543), f.d.v.

² Paolo Giovio, *op. cit.*

³ F. Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen*, p. 45. There is no printed edition of the *Hasht Bihisht*. For the purposes of this article, I have used British Museum Add. MSS. 7646-7, where the relevant passages are to be found on fols. 73^r-75^r (Book II, Dastan 7) and fols. 106^r-108^r (Book III, Dastan 4).

⁴ Babinger, *op. cit.* p. 39. I have examined the relevant passages in the Vienna National Bibliothek MS. Nr. 986 by means of photographs kindly supplied to me by that library: I learn, however, that a text is in course of being printed at Ankara under the care of M. Faik Reşat Unat.

⁵ Babinger, *op. cit.* p. 73: Giese's introduction to his edition of the Anonymous Chronicle (see p. 467, n. 8).

work usually called the *Ta'rikh-i-Nishānji* (much valued by the Turks down to modern times).¹

There is, in fact, no sign that, at the time when Idris wrote, there existed any earlier source on which he could have drawn for his account of the origin of the Janissaries, except the chronicles which we have examined.² We must suppose, in those circumstances, that Idris used those sources and that the Idrisian Version is based on the Chroniclers' Narrative. In that case the differences between the two accounts ought to be explicable on literary grounds. I shall endeavour to show that this is the case.

It is unnecessary, for this purpose, to set out the Idrisian Version. Whether in the original Persian or in the scarcely less ornate Turkish of Sa'd ad-dīn, the relevant passages are far too long to translate in full. A fairly lengthy summary will suffice. The Idrisian Version, like the Chroniclers' Narrative, consists of two episodes, one under Orkhan and one under Murad I.

¹ Babinger, op. cit. p. 103. I have referred to the edition of this work printed at Constantinople 1279/1862, pp. 112, 119.

² I would point out that there is also an early line of Ottoman historians who entirely omit these episodes. The head of this line appears to be Karamani Mehmed Pasha, who died in 1481: for him see Babinger, op. cit., p. 24, and extracts in *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası* (1924), pp. 85 ff., 142 ff. Since his work must date from the time when Urui, as we have him, took final shape, its importance is obvious. When critically examined, it will probably be found to contain valuable personal information on the reign of Mehmed II. For earlier times, the author's written sources can only have been our chronicles or earlier forms or recensions of them; as to such earlier forms of the chronicles, some valuable information may be gleaned from his work, when subjected to scholarly examination. Karamani Mehmed Pasha is said to be the source used by Rūhī Chelebi al-Edrenewi, who wrote between 1500 and 1520, contemporary with Idris and Neshri: Rūhī's work again has not been printed, but I find in Bodleian MS. Marsh 313 that he omits the episode in the reign of Murad I (that manuscript unfortunately has a lacuna covering the reign of Orkhan). Rūhī in turn was used by Rustem Pasha, who wrote c. 1560 in the last years of Sulaiman Qānūnī: for him see Babinger, op. cit. pp. 80-2, and extracts by Dr. Ludwig Förer, *Türk. Bibl.*, Bd. xxi (Leipzig, 1923). Rustem's contemporary Lutfi Pasha seems to belong to the same group. These writers seem to limit themselves deliberately to an account of wars and campaigns, foreign or civil, and to exclude other matters, such as the episodes in which we are interested. Their works thus do not invalidate the view expressed in the text that for our purpose the Chroniclers' Narrative is the only early source.

Episode 1 : Reign of Orkhan. After the capture of Nicomedia Orkhan makes Brusa his capital. His brother 'Alā ad-dīn, who had made Brusa his corner of retirement, offered congratulations on the victory at Nicomedia, and pointed out that the house of Othman had acquired majesty and independence, that its military power increased from day to day, and that appropriate customs and laws should be introduced. First, the Ottoman ruler should coin in his own name. Secondly, soldiers should have a particular dress, distinguishing them from enemy forces. Thirdly, the army should be increased by a force of infantry. Orkhan approved these suggestions. In the year A.H. 729 he began to coin in his own name in place of the Seljuk coinage. The Greeks and Franks wore scarlet woollen garments and red, yellow and black caps, and he beautified his army with white caps. This custom continued till the time of Yildirim Bayezid, who chose various garments for his army, at which time, on the suggestion of Timurtash Beg, the white cap was appointed for the ruler's personal troops and a red cap for the retainers of great men. Mehmed II made white caps with gold embroidery the special dress of the Janissaries, and red caps for the servants of great men. The *uskuſ*, worn by the chiefs of the Janissaries of the *Buluſ*, was the invention of Sulaiman Pasha, the conqueror of Bulair, and was worn out of respect for Maulānā Jalāl ad-dīn Rūmī. The custom began under Murad I of decorating it with gold embroidery for ceremonial occasions. As to increasing the army, they consulted the Qāđī of Bilejik, Maulānā Khalil. They chose active youths from among the children of the Turks. Maulānā Khalil was put in charge, and collected brave youths; these were given an *aſhe* a day on campaign, which ceased upon their return, when they worked at cultivation in their own homes, and were exempted from taxes. This *piyāda* [i.e. *yaya*] increased in numbers and committed abuses, whereupon the ruler consulted his counsellors and it was decided to select suitable children of the infidels and bring them the honour of conversion to Islam. Overseers were appointed to collect within a few years some thousand infidel children who should receive the light of Islam and render service and obedience. They were given pay of an *aſhe* or more according to ability and the name of *Yenicheri*. Others, seeing their rewards and advancement, became eager to hand over their children, and several thousand unbelievers were converted to Islam. In the past 200 years in this way more than 200,000 persons have decided to embrace Islam and under Ottoman rulers there has been an incomparable extension of the faith. After the innovation of the *Yenicheri*, the *piyāda* received lands instead of pay with exemption from taxes. In this mode also, a mounted force was formed from children of the Turks and given special lands and called *Musellem*.

Episode 2: Reign of Murad I. Lala Shāhin conquered the district of Zagora and a great quantity of booty of all kinds was obtained. Maulānā Kara Rustem, a learned jurist from Karaman, observing that the legal rule regarding the one-fifth of all booty was not in force, drew the attention of the Qāđī'asker Maulānā Kara Khalil to the relevant verse, declaring that a fifth of all booty belonged to Allah. Maulānā Kara Khalil referred the matter to the Sultan, who gave orders to proceed according to the tradition and entrusted the collection of the fifth to Maulānā Kara Rustem. They placed a value on all kinds of booty and valued each prisoner at 125 Othmani (*aſhe*) and established the custom of taking 25 Othmani (*aſhe*) as the fifth part of a prisoner.

The Idrisian Version bears, as we were led to expect, evident signs of dependence on the Chroniclers' Narrative. The division into two episodes, and their dating, is the same in both : so are the personalities who take part. Even in high-flown Persian the speech of 'Alā ad-dīn preserves verbal echoes of his speech in the Chroniclers' Narrative. Dependence on 'Āshiqpashazāde in particular can be inferred from the part played by Kara Khalīl, the reason given for the colour of the caps, and the absence of any reference to Dervish sanction.

The vital difference between the Idrisian Version and the Chroniclers' Narrative is that the former transfers the account of the origin of the Janissaries from its place in the narrative of the reign of Murad I to a passage in the section comprising the reign of Orkhan, where it becomes combined with (or more accurately, appended to) the account of the origin of the white cap : as a corollary, the Idrisian Version treats the episode in the reign of Murad I merely as the institution of a booty tax in money. This difference, however, can be accounted for on literary grounds, if attention is turned to Idris' method of composition as exemplified in these passages.

It will be seen that after he has given the narrative of the adoption of the white caps (according to 'Āshikpashazāde), Idris proceeds to deal with a number of later changes in regard to headgear and costume. It is evident that, writing for the highest circles of the Court in his own time, he felt it incumbent on him to connect the first introduction of a distinguishing uniform with later changes and even with the customs of his own day. No doubt, Court or administrative traditions provided him with his material here : in the only point to which the chronicles also refer in this connection, the origin of the gold-braided *uskuf*, he agrees with them in dating it under Murad I.¹ These later developments do not belong chronologically to this part of the narrative at all : it is by a literary device that Idris incorporates these matters here, as more or less completing the story of Ottoman military or formal dress down to his own time. That is his literary method.

Now, his placing in this passage the episode of the origin of

¹ Uruj, p. 24. The story bears a highly legendary air in the chronicles.

the Janissaries is an example of the same method. Still following the chronology of the Chroniclers' Narrative, he deals with the *yaya*. Again, he seeks to complete this with related developments down to his own time. He therefore brings in the origin of the Janissaries: he finds in his sources no account of the *devshirme* which was a feature of the Janissary organization in his own day, and so he supplies an account of this, which serves the double purpose of filling a gap and of giving a flattering (but inaccurate) account of current arrangements. Finally, he brings in the origin of the *Musellem* which again comes from a still later passage in the chronicles. Once again, it is a question of the literary device of welding into a single passage and a consecutive narrative material and episodes of different dates.

The fact is that the difference in chronological arrangement between the Idrisian Version and the Chroniclers' Narrative is only apparent, not real. Idris is studiously vague as to chronology. For literary reasons, he moves the episode of the origin of the Janissaries into his narrative of Orkhan's reign but he does not *date* the episode in that reign. Later writers, as we shall see, have taken him in that sense, but in so doing they have conjured a difference over facts out of a literary device.

It followed, of course, that in the second episode under Murad I, Idris could not deal with the origin of the Janissaries at all, for he had already done so. All that was left to him to use was the financial aspect of the *ghanimat* tax. Still following his same method, he hastens to connect that with the institutions known to himself and his contemporaries in the Ottoman service, and therefore converts the episode of Kara Rustem into the institution of a money tax recognizable as the *penjik* tax which was being collected in his own time.

The Idrisian Version, therefore, does not represent an account of the origin of the Janissaries different from, much less superior to, the account contained in the Chroniclers' Narrative. It is merely the Chroniclers' Narrative rearranged by another hand. Its importance is due to the fact that, after the lapse of another sixty years and more, it was adopted by the two most famous and influential of Ottoman historians, Sa'd ad-din and 'Ali. The former virtually translates it into Turkish, the latter

adopts it in an abbreviated form.¹ They are hardly to be blamed for thus giving currency and predominance to the Idrisian Version. Like Idris, they were Court historians. Idris' work was already of respectable age in their time, sixty years nearer the sources than they were, full (as we have seen) of useful material not to be found in the Chronicles, and composed with evident labour and studiousness. They preferred it to the rough chronicles, already in their time circulating in texts and recensions which differed much among themselves: a more critical approach could not be expected of them. However, as a consequence, they set upon the Idrisian Version the seal of their own dazzling reputations.

Before leaving the Idrisian Version one concluding remark is necessary. Where Idris' work does not pervert or contradict its own written sources (the chronicles), it is a first-rate source in its own right, and its statements may and do form our earliest evidence on important matters. The most notable of these for our purpose is the question of the original constitution of the *yaya*. According to Idris, these were first of all paid troops, and only later did they receive grants of land, when their experiment had proved unsatisfactory. There is no good reason for rejecting this, the earliest, record on this point and reversing the process of their development.

(v) *The Bektāshī Legends*

These are only legends and little time need be spent on them. We can gather their earliest form and something of their growth from the Bektāshī compendium known as the *Vilāyatnāma of Hāji Bektāsh*.² This work has been claimed to belong, as a whole, to the early fifteenth century, and thus to be earlier than the existing texts of the chronicles. That claim, however, may

¹ I have referred to the printed editions of Sa'd ad-dīn, Constantinople, A.H. 1279, 2 vols., vol. i, 37-41, and 74-5, and 'Ālī, Constantinople, 5 vols., vol. v. pp. 42-3 and 69.

² See Dr. Erich Gross, "Die Vilayetname des Hâğgi Bektasch", *Türk. Bibl.*, xxv (Leipzig, 1927): the passages referred to are on pp. 133 and 153-5. Gross's views as to date have been controverted and reference should now be made to J. K. Birge, *The Bektāshī Order of Dervishes*, p. 48.

be excessive, particularly as regards the passages of interest to us. However, the *Vilāyatnāma* is, generally speaking, of the fifteenth century, and even those passages cannot be much, if at all, later than our texts of the chronicles. We certainly find here the kind of legend which the Bektashis were circulating at the time when they were seeking to establish their connection with the Janissaries and which roused the ire of 'Āshiqpashazāde.

The longest and earliest form of these legends in the *Vilāyatnāma* is made to relate to 'Othmān I, not Orkhan. According to it 'Othmān I committed a breach of a truce with the Christians, and was summoned for judgement on this offence before the Seljuk Sultan at Konia. He was then sent for judgement to Hāji Bektash. The latter used to make his disciples wear white caps, locally manufactured. One of these caps had been one day brought to him which was of exceptional height and which no one could wear : he therefore bent it in the middle and put it away in a cupboard saying that its destined wearer would one day appear. When 'Othmān was brought before him, Hāji Bektash gave him this special cap with a blessing, a lighted candle, and a sword. Later Hāji Bektash took refuge in the lands conquered by 'Othmān and his children and invited the Seljuk Sultan to confer a high office on 'Othmān : the Seljuk Sultan, on learning that 'Othmān possessed the high cap and the sword and had received the blessing of Bektash, conferred on him the Sanjak of Sultan Önü (the original Ottoman holding).

Two briefer supplements also contained in our text of the *Vilāyatnāma* furnish a different story. According to these, on an occasion when 'Othmān I was hard pressed, Hāji Bektash sent him miraculous reinforcements : these troops complained of being insufficiently or improperly clad for their duty, and thereupon Hāji Bektash cut pieces of felt from the hem of his robe and laid these on their heads.

A marginal gloss then adds that they were called *Yenicheri* from the word *yen* meaning a sleeve, a false etymology substituting this word for *yeni*, new. This gloss seems to record the transition to the form of the legend which appears in European writers from the seventeenth century onwards and according to which the Janissaries' head-dress originated through the sleeve

of Hāji Bektash falling over a Janissary's head and down his back when Bektash was giving him a blessing. This incident reaches a final form in which it is said to have occurred on the field of Kossovo I immediately after the killing of Murad I by a wounded Serbian, an event foreseen or foretold by Hāji Bektash, who is thereupon also put to death for failing to prevent what he had foreseen.

We can see clearly enough here a development of a pure legend originally attached to 'Othmān I. Evidently, this legend is not represented by the story of the white cap as given in the Chroniclers' Narrative and, as pointed out already, this is one reason for not classing that incident in its entirety as a Bektashi interpolation.

(vi) *The use of the Turkish sources by European writers*

Even the latest Byzantine writers, Chalcocondylas, Ducas and Phrantzes, do not use written Turkish sources. They are largely concerned with contemporary events and are themselves, for us, sources for Ottoman history. They are of the same date as the composition, in their surviving form, of the Turkish chronicles. For events before their own time the Byzantine writers rely upon earlier Greek writers or on hearsay, not on written Turkish sources.

When we come to the earliest Latin or European writers there is no reason to dissent from von Hammer's judgement that their sources for early Turkish history were hearsay. They were themselves again sometimes eyewitnesses and they had some access to Byzantine writers, and the later among them used the works of the earlier. They did not use written Turkish sources. This is true of Nicolaus Sagundinus (c. 1450),¹ Spandugino (c. 1505),² Felix Petantius (before 1516),³ Joannes Adelphus (1513),⁴ Joannes Cuspinianus (d. 1529),⁵ Paulus

¹ For the work of Sagundinus, see J. Ramus, *Elegiarum de rebus gestis Archiducum Austriae* (Louvain, 1553).

² See above p. 467 and n. 6.

³ For Petantius see above p. 467, and n. 7.

⁴ Joannes Adelphus, *Die Türkisch Chronica usw.* (Strassburg, 1513).

⁵ Joannes Cuspinianus, *De Origine Turcorum*, first printed after his death as part of his *De Caesaribus et Imperatoribus opus insigne* (Strassburg, 1540) and then separately at Antwerp, 1541.

Jovius (c. 1540),¹ or Sansovino (c. 1560).² Between 1450 and 1550 the only Latin writer who offers us something quite remarkable in regard to Ottoman origins is Fr. Georgius de Hungaria; his knowledge of the campaign of the Mamluk Sultan Baibars in eastern Asia Minor and of the names of the post-Seljuk princedoms is without parallel.³

It was not until the last forty years of the sixteenth century that Turkish written sources became available to European scholars in translation. The first to become so were the ancient chronicles, to be precise the Anonymous Chronicle. This is in line with the status of these sources in the sixteenth century as indicated above; it is indeed a confirmation of the respect in which they were then held that the first European enquirers and translators should have had these placed in their hands. The earliest of these translators were Caudir von Spiegel (1567) and the contemporary translator of the manuscript known as the Bek Chronicle.⁴ Then comes the more famous Leunclavius (1588): the latter used, in different works, both the longer and the shorter (1550) recension of the Anonymous Chronicle.⁵ In the seventeenth century the Anonymous Chronicle continued to be utilized by European writers. This is the case with Knolles in 1603⁶ and the republication of his work by Rycaut in 1687,⁷ while Spiegel's work reappears through Podestà in 1671⁸ and Geropoldi in 1686.⁹

¹ See above p. 467 and n. 4.

² Francesco Sansovino, *Dell' Historia Universale dell' Origine et Impero de' Turchi* (Venice, 1560).

³ *Tractatus de moribus, condicionibus et nequicia Turcorum*, cap. i.

⁴ For these early translations see the remarks by Giese and by Babinger in their respective introductions to their editions of the Anonymous Chronicle and Uruj. Spiegel's translation appears in Markus Brosian, *Chronica oder Acta von der türkischen Tyrannen* (Neisse, 1567). The Bek Chronicle was a manuscript belonging to Jerome Bek of Leopoldsdorf.

⁵ Leunclavius, *Annales sultanorum othmanidorum* (Frankfurt, 1588), *Historiae Musulmanae* (Frankfurt, 1591).

⁶ Richard Knolles, *The General Historie of the Turks* (London, 1603).

⁷ Sir Paul Rycaut, *The Turkish History . . . with a continuation . . . whereunto is added the Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1687-1700).

⁸ J. B. Podestà, *Origo et Gesta Ottomanici Stirpis* (Vienna, 1671). He also translated Sadeddin.

⁹ Antonio Geropoldi, *Annali de' Sultani Osmanidi etc.* (Venice, 1686).

Meanwhile, the Idrisian Version had become available also to European scholars through translations of Sa'd ad-dīn. The most famous of these was Bratutti's Italian translation, which appeared in 1649.¹ Seaman, in 1652, translated Sa'd ad-dīn's account of Orkhan's reign into English and this, of course, included the whole of the first episode of the Idrisian Version.²

It is also evident that by about this time European travellers or officials in the Levant began to come across the Bektashi Legends in their then current forms. In his own additions to Knolles' work, Rycaut gives the Kossovo version of the sleeve incident, oblivious of the fact that in reproducing Knolles' own work he had already given the Chroniclers' Narrative of the origin of the white cap and of the Janissaries.³

Thus by the end of the seventeenth century European students were in possession of three apparently distinct narratives, without the critical apparatus or ability to understand their interrelationship—the Chroniclers' Narrative, the Idrisian Version, and the Bektashi Legends. The result is confusion throughout the works of eighteenth century writers, who juxtapose these sources or reconcile them as each judges best. Demetrius Cantemir (translated into English in 1734) gives a summary of the Idrisian version under the reign of Orkhan, attributes under the reign of Murad I the origin of the Janissaries to the imposition of a tax on booty, mentioning Kara Khalil but not Kara Rustem, and adds to this the sleeve incident, but not at Kossovo.⁴ Aaron Hill, in 1709, gives the Kossovo version of the sleeve incident.⁵ Marsigli, in 1732, attributes the

¹ Vincenzo Bratutti, *Chronica dell' origine e progressione della casa ottomana composto da Saidino Turco* (Vienna, 1649).

² W. Seaman, *The Reign of Sultan Orhan* (London, 1652).

³ In Rycaut's work Knolles's original narrative taken from the chronicles is in vol. i, pp. 128, 132: the sleeve incident is in vol. ii on p. 72 of the additional section by Rycaut entitled *Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, while on p. 90 of the same section Rycaut again refers to Kara Rustem and the institution of the Janissaries under Murad I, i.e. to the Chroniclers' Narrative.

⁴ Demetrius Cantemir, Prince of Moldavia, *History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire*, translated by N. Tindale, 1734: originally written in Latin, but apparently first printed in this English translation, posthumously, the author having died in 1723.

⁵ Aaron Hill, *Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, 1709.

origin of the Janissaries to Murad I and gives the sleeve incident, but not at Kossovo.¹

Late in the eighteenth century confusion still persists in the very famous work of Mouradja d'Ohsson, though in the main he adopts the Idrisian Version and is chiefly responsible, together with von Hammer, for its subsequent predominance and (we may add) the misunderstanding of it.² d'Ohsson, of course, splits the story up and deals with it in different parts of his work, which is descriptive, not consecutively historical. In one place he gives the history of the white cap and later head-dresses from the Idrisian Version. Elsewhere he states that Orkhan, in 1330, instituted the Janissaries to replace the *yaya* and recruited them from Christian prisoners, thus fastening on later students the apparent chronology of the Idrisian Version, which has been criticized above: he adds to this the sleeve incident but not at Kossovo. Elsewhere he refers to the Sultan's right to one-fifth of the booty, a right established according to him in 1362 under Murad I.

Von Hammer's account is practically a complete translation of the Idrisian Version from the pages of Sa'd ad-dīn. He cites the latter in his footnotes as his principal authority, but he was well aware of what his less learned predecessors and successors did not know, namely, that Sa'd ad-dīn himself was only reproducing Idris: he made, for this reason, great efforts to obtain one of the rare manuscripts of the *Hasht Bihisht*, ultimately with success.³

To his presentation of the Idrisian Version, von Hammer added the sleeve incident, but not at Kossovo: he placed it in the reign of Orkhan. There is a mystery here, because in his footnotes he gives as his sources for this incident Neshri and 'Alī. The incident, of course, is not in Neshri's real text at all, and Neshri, in any case, follows 'Ashiqpashazāde who, if he had ever heard the sleeve incident in the form which we know, would

¹ Comte de Marsigli, *L'État Militaire de l'Empire Ottoman* (1732), ch. xv, p. 67.

² Mouradja d'Ohsson, *Tableau Général de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1787-1820). See vol. ii, pp. 135 ff., vol. iii, pp. 39 ff. and 416.

³ See above p. 448, n. 1.

have been exceedingly enraged. As for 'Ālī, he again uses the Idrisian Version, which contains nothing of the kind. It seems that von Hammer in his footnotes here has confused his sources : as he places the incident under Orkhan, one may suspect that he is really following d'Ohsson, but he might have had an interpolated or corrupt text of Neshri or 'Āshiqpashazāde.

The vital point of von Hammer's treatment is that he agrees with d'Ohsson in adopting a superficial chronology from the Idrisian Version, and therefore he locates in the reign of Orkhan both the origin of the white caps and the creation of the Janissaries (including the *devshirme*) and treats the episode under Murad I as the imposition merely of a (money) tax on booty.¹

Von Hammer's account naturally reappears in the works of writers who were mere abbreviators of his own great history, such as Creasy, de la Jonquière or Lord Eversley.² Inability to use Turkish sources, however, compels also such writers as Zinkeisen and Iorga to rely on von Hammer in this matter, although in other respects their works are original and independent.³ The very imperfect monograph of Ahmad Jevad, generally speaking, corresponds, as d'Ohsson's version does, with the Idrisian Version.⁴ Theodore Menzel, again, seems to draw mainly

¹ In dealing with the origin of the Janissaries d'Ohsson particularly was handicapped (as was also von Hammer) because he approached the question from the state of Ottoman military formations in his own time. There had been a long development, resulting in a huge and complex organization, in which many old distinctions had fallen into oblivion or had been overlaid by later classifications. Thus, *Qapu Kullari* had become a term which included both the various Palace corps (the original *Qapu Khalqi*) and the Janissaries, and the *devshirme* had (in its time) served to recruit both formations, so that the true and original distinction between them observed in the Chroniclers' Narrative was either unnoticed or disbelieved. Again, the '*Ulūfejis* or troops paid from the Treasury (as opposed to the feudal levies) included the *yaya* under the same classification with the *Qapu Kullari*, thus again blurring an original distinction. It is extremely difficult to disentangle early Ottoman military history if one starts to work backwards from the later state of affairs, and this has been a secondary cause of confusion in regard to the origin of the Janissaries.

² Sir W. Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks* (1854); Vicomte A. de la Jonquière, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* (1881); Lord Eversley, *The Turkish Empire* (1917).

³ J. W. Zinkeisen, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa* (Gesch. d. eur. Staaten) (1840-63); N. Iorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches* (1908-13).

⁴ Ahmed Djevad, *État Militaire Ottoman* (1882).

on d'Ohsson and thus also has the Idrisian Version.¹ In 1916 H. A. Gibbons made an attempt to re-write early Ottoman history, again without knowing Turkish : his speculations as to the early history of military organization are valueless.² F. W. Hasluck observed the confusion among European writers over the origin of the Janissaries but, once more for lack of ability to examine Turkish sources, he had no key to the puzzle.³

F. Giese, in his article of 1924 mentioned above,⁴ was mainly concerned to correct Gibbons' mistaken reconstruction and also to develop the theory of a connection between the beginnings of Ottoman expansion and the *Ahīs*. Moreover, he relied only on 'Āshiqpashazāde. He formed the theory that the white cap belonged to the *Ahīs* (he gives the red cap to the *Kizilbash* naturally enough), claims that Othman's followers were *Ahīs* and so used the white cap before Orkhan, that Orkhan added the *yaya* to Othman's *Ahīs*, and then Murad I added the Janissaries to the "war-worn" *yaya*. Whatever the merits of the theory as to Ottoman-*Ahī* connections, this account as a historical sequence is evidently an artificial reconstruction of the data to be found in 'Āshiqpashazāde. Similar accounts are offered by those who have extended Giese's *Ahī*-theory by further explanations of the special character of the *ghāzīs* in early Ottoman times.

Professor Gibb and Mr. Bowen in the latest study of the subject do, in substance, adhere to the Chroniclers' Narrative.⁵ They distinguish *Qapu Kullari* existing under Orkhan, then the *yaya* under the same ruler, and finally the creation of the Janissaries from prisoners of war under Murad I ; they then attribute the institution of the *devshirme* to Murad II. Their account is much coloured by current views regarding the *Ahīs* and the *ghāzīs*, but they also have to contend with the same difficulties as d'Ohsson,⁶ because the main purpose of their work is to describe Ottoman institutions as they existed in the sixteenth

¹ Theodore Menzel, *Das Korps der Janitscharen in Beit. z. Kenntnis d. Or.*, i (Jahrbuch. der Münch. or. Ges., 1902-5), 47.

² H. A. Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (1916).

³ F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, ii. 483 ff.

⁴ p. 448, n. 2.

⁵ Gibb and Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, pp. 48, 53, 54, 58, 59 and 64.

⁶ See above p. 478, n. 2.

century and later, so that they start from the later elaborations and read these back into the primitive institutions. Thus, starting from the later '*Ulūfeji* classification, they confound the *Qapu Kullari* and the Janissaries from the beginning, so that they miss the vital distinction in origin between them. Then, again arguing from the later conditions, they regard the *Musellem* as earlier than, or contemporary with, the *yaya* in origin, a view not supported by either the Chroniclers' Narrative or the Idrisian Version, and consider that the *yaya* had grants of land originally, not pay, which is contrary to the Idrisian Version, the earliest account of the matter. The connection of the *Bektashis* with the white caps they regard as wholly apocryphal.

One may say, therefore, with all respect to such distinguished scholars, that the problem for them has continued to be bedevilled by the lack of orderly and critical analysis of the sources. By such an analysis we have endeavoured to restore in its simplicity and self-consistency a story first innocently distorted by the literary devices of Idris, less innocently embroidered by the *Bektashis*, then lost to sight in the tangle of later Ottoman administrative rules and traditions, and later recovered by even the greatest of European Turcologists only in a muddled and unrecognizable state.

ROBERT GROSSETESTE, BISHOP OF LINCOLN ¹

By SIR MAURICE POWICKE, D.LITT., LL.D., LITT.D., F.B.A.

FORMERLY REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

THE great man to whom I invite your attention this afternoon died in October 1253. His memory, in this seven hundredth year after his death, is to be celebrated at Lincoln and made the occasion of a volume of essays about his work as a teacher, scholar and ecclesiastic. In pre-Reformation days it was a living memory throughout the West ; it was revived, in certain learned quarters, in the seventeenth century, and again in the first considerable biography of him by Samuel Pegge (1793). It naturally received fitting and intelligent recognition during the great historical renaissance in the nineteenth century. The life of Grosseteste published in 1899 by F. S. Stevenson took account of the new learning ; but Grosseteste is really coming to his own in our time, as the true significance of his work as a scholar, notably in the history of scientific method, and as a churchman, is revealed. The definitive life of him has still to be written, and can only be written by a very learned, versatile and penetrating scholar indeed.

I do not mean to suggest any contrast between the man whom we can now see and the man seen more clearly by his contemporaries. I mean that we can now better realize the nature of a man who was felt by all, whether they admired or disliked him, to be a portentous person, a man of universal genius. Grosseteste lived in the open. He was not one of those who have to be discovered, or whose discovery is due to the moods and fashions of an age which is better able to appreciate, and can easily overrate, the merits of genius misunderstood or disregarded while it was struggling to express itself. Grosseteste could not and need not be admired or detested or, except in one regard, be appreciated by us today more than he was in his

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of January 1953.

own day. The exception, indeed his significance in the history of science, is only an exception because scientists here and there today are becoming more interested in the history of science and can marvel at the clear-headedness and insight of a man outstanding in the medieval schools. Natural science today has nothing to *learn* from him except a better understanding of movements of thought which it has been wont to despise, and a humble sense of gratitude to any fine mind in any age which has helped to produce it. From this point of view the realization that Grosseteste had a truly scientific mind is in itself part of the historical process which sweeps away the mist and prejudice between us and any period in the past. The historian is not concerned to make a hero of Grosseteste or to pick him out to the disadvantage of his fellows: this would be to falsify history. The historian's duty is to make Grosseteste live so clearly that we can better understand the age in which he lived, thought and strove to make men what he believed they ought to be. He was a man of his age in the sense in which Dr. Johnson or Sir Walter Scott was a man of his age, and like them the more impressive because he never thought of himself as anything else.

Grosseteste was probably not a nickname, but a casual family name, on the way to being what we call a surname. His future designation in scholastic circles was *Lincolniensis*, an appropriate recognition of his identification in his lifetime with his duties as a bishop, though from the scholastic point of view his reputation had nothing or little to do with his ecclesiastical status. He was a Suffolk man, born in a humble tenement in a village called Stow, one of the simple common rural names for any village or small market town. What could be more English than "Bob Fathead of Stow"? Many years later, when he was having a violent dispute about his rights of episcopal visitation with his dean and chapter at Lincoln, the canons were unmannerly enough to make it a grievance that they had a man of such low origin as their bishop. Grosseteste would never have said this kind of thing of anybody. He had good manners, not just in the conventional sense of decent and polite behaviour, as expected in table manners in courts and

monasteries, but as the outcome of the habits learned in a good home or rooted in respect for the rights and duties of the individual, whoever he might be. Quite apart from the fact that, though he was the most outspoken of men, he did not indulge, as most controversialists did, in sheer rhetorical abuse for its own sake, he early acquired a deep respect for the structure of society, and a firm belief in the personal obligations which his place in it imposed upon every man. His lesser writings and verses on such matters as the rules of husbandry composed for the widow of the Earl of Lincoln, and on the way a serving boy or page should behave in hall reveal these traits. The boy standing by his lord's table must be *vultu simplex*, not looking about everywhere; he should keep his nose clean, not scratch himself or break into laughter in the presence of his lord. Another work, the *statuta familie* or household regulations, which survives in one manuscript, and in a fifteenth century English translation, reveals a practical and observant mind, directed by the same love of order. "When your bailiffs come before you, speak to them fairly and gently in the open and not in privacy. Show them merry cheer and ask them how the men and tenants fare, how the corn has done, and the stores increased. Ask such things openly and they will dread you the more." The gentlemen and yeomen of the household should wear their robes in the lord's presence and especially at meat, and not appear in old shabby robes and shoes. In hall the household should sit together, not in little groups scattered about the tables. Alms should be distributed wisely and temperately to the poor, the sick and feeble and beggars, not to boys and knaves or wasted on the dinners of grooms. The officers of the household should be instructed to welcome friends and strangers whom they know would be acceptable, in such manner that the visitors may know that they are welcome and that the lord is pleased that they should come. The lord should always dine in hall if it is possible, for the sake of discipline and worship.

I lay stress upon Grosseteste's orderly, stern but gracious spirit because it was innate in him and directed everything that he did both as a thinker and a director of souls. It was

grounded in instinct and habit, yet trained by reason. Above all, it had the quality which was inconsistent with laziness and pomposity. Grosseteste always looked to the end, not the means. He believed in and understood the society in which he found himself, without a trace of easy-going acceptance or prejudice. It never occurred to him to reject the good because it might disturb existing conventions or traditions. Thus he was one of the first to welcome the followers of St. Francis and St. Dominic, not only because he admired them, but also because he saw in them the helpers of whom a bishop who meant business was most in need. He was shocked when he was told that his friend Alexander of Stavensby, of all people, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, formerly a teacher who had lectured to St. Dominic and his disciples at Toulouse, had publicly reviled the Franciscans when he heard that they were about to settle in his diocese at Chester. There was room, Grosseteste declared, for both orders in Chester. "This incredible thing, if it is true, I believe can only have proceeded from some sudden disturbance of your mind, not from deliberate conviction" (*Epistolae*, p. 121). Grosseteste always acted with deliberation. That is why his anger could be so terrible.

The letter which I have just quoted was written soon after Grosseteste became Bishop of Lincoln. He was already well over sixty years old. I have always found it hard to believe that the busiest and most active bishop of his time did his hardest work when he was between sixty-five or -seven and eighty-three or -five years of age. Yet, to use his own words, this incredible thing seems to be true. During these eighteen years he made himself a power to be reckoned with in England, twice visited the Papal Court at Lyons, on the second occasion (1250) haranguing the Pope and cardinals, was in touch with everybody and wrote or supervised much of his literary work. The fact is significant. As a bishop he was reaping the harvest of long experience and mental discipline. He had nothing to fear, a great deal to say, and the virility to act strenuously upon his convictions.

The facts could only be disputed on the assumption that the Master Robert Grosseteste who attested one of the charters of

St. Hugh of Lincoln between 1286-9, and was the subject of one of Gerald of Wales's glowing appreciations sometime in the nineties (1190-9), was somebody else, a most unlikely assumption. The evidence itself points the other way. The undated charter of a Bishop Hugh of Lincoln in confirmation of the rights of the priory of St. Andrew at Northampton has been shown, by examination of other witnesses to it, to have been issued by St. Hugh and before the end of 1189. Master Robert is the last witness, and was probably one of the bishop's clerks. Grosseteste may well have studied in the episcopal school at Lincoln, and have attracted the great bishop's attention. The letter of Gerald of Wales praises Robert as a prodigy of remarkable proficiency in the liberal arts, wide learning, and dexterity in legal and medical matters. It suggests a young master of arts who was taking, in his pre-theological days, the whole of knowledge as his province. It refers to him also as then a clerk of William de Vere, Bishop of Hereford (d. 1199), and it is worth noting that the great baronial family to which Bishop William belonged had wide estates in Essex and held lands in Suffolk of the abbey of Bury St. Edmund's, and that all the various Stows in Suffolk were fairly near to Bury. The ways in which an able boy might reach the schools or enter the households of the great are familiar; many examples could be given; Grosseteste may have owed his chance to a local family or a friendly abbot.

His career is known with certainty from his appearance in Oxford after the year 1215. Those who have given minute attention to his earlier writings have satisfied themselves that they date from about 1200 onwards, and were the outcome of teaching and study at Oxford, and, as no evidence can be adduced to the contrary, we may agree with Father Daniel Callus that Grosseteste lectured in the budding university between 1200 and 1209, left England, like so many other scholars, during the Great Interdict, and returned to Oxford about 1214 after the quarrel between King John and Archbishop Stephen Langton had been composed. It is indeed unlikely that a scholar who became one of the first chancellors of the University, after its formal recognition and the provision of an

official head, and whose scientific and philosophical reputation was already so high, had no previous experience of the foremost school in England. Whether, during his absence in France, he was a theological student in Paris and proceeded to the higher degree of master or doctor in theology is uncertain, but the fact that a chancellor in Oxford had to be a master in theology makes it likely that he qualified for the degree there or continued his studies for a year or two in order to qualify for it after his return to Oxford. However this may be, he did not desert his philosophical studies. One of his works, his marginal glosses on Aristotle's *Physics*, was jotted down at the end of his Oxford career (1230-5) in the years when he was acting as *lector* to the lately established house of the Franciscans; but by this time he was especially immersed in the Biblical teaching and expositions required of a theologian. In 1235 he was elected Bishop of Lincoln, the largest diocese in England, stretching from the Humber to the Thames, and comprehending Lincoln in the north and Oxford in the south.

Here I turn to Grosseteste's work as a scholar and the problems to which his enormous output gives rise; and I should say something if only for the reason that he maintained most of his multifarious interests to the close of his life, and that his interest in scientific method was, to say the least, analogous to his ordered activity as a public man. The study of the writings of a medieval scholar can be very difficult and exciting. Bibliographical problems about authenticity, transmission and dating may lead to significant contributions to history and open up new vistas of learned society. As any bibliographer who starts with printed books would tell us, similar results may follow from the study of a modern writer, Boswell, for example, but how much more difficult and exciting the pursuit becomes where everything is in manuscripts scattered about in the libraries of Europe from Scotland to Naples and Spain to Poland, manuscripts as often as not anonymous, hard to read and with a perplexing history of their own. In that world there are no publishers, few precise ascriptions and fewer dates. Now in no case is this study more difficult, more exciting and more rewarding than in that of Grosseteste's writings. Twenty-three years ago I pecked

at the surface when I stumbled on the problem of his work on Aristotle's *Ethics*, and I was never more interested in my life ; though, I should add, I have never dared to peck again.

Grosseteste found many admirers. One of the greatest was Roger Bacon, who, while Grosseteste was bishop, was buying books and lecturing in Paris on the same sort of things that had interested the bishop in his youth ; and, twelve years after the bishop's death, began, in A. G. Little's phrase, to pour out his soul in reply to the Pope's command in three great works (1265-8). Bacon was profoundly influenced by Grosseteste, notably by his discussion of scientific method and, it is now believed, was one of the transmitters of his views. He also says that Grosseteste knew very little Greek and Hebrew, a remark which has complicated a difficulty not yet resolved, though the present tendency is to say that Grosseteste may have known the Hebrew alphabet and was certainly active in promoting the knowledge of the Hebrew text of the Psalter, while on the contrary he was acquainted with Greek, could use the Septuagint, and had a greater share in his translations from the Greek than is usually allowed. Another great admirer was John Wyclif, who frequently by his quotations gives useful indications about Grosseteste's works and whose influence upon Bohemian scholars may explain the existence in Czecho-Slovakia of one important manuscript. A third admirer was more of a bibliophil. This was Thomas Gascoigne, chancellor of the University of Oxford in the middle of the fifteenth century. Gascoigne loved to collect books and to make notes in them, and to examine books in libraries. He took special pleasure in the books left by Grosseteste to the library of the Oxford Franciscans and described what he saw there. His observations have prompted scholars to study the evidence contained in the books once possessed by Grosseteste, and in particular notes in these and in other books in the bishop's own handwriting.

Here are two examples of the value of such investigations. First, they have gone to confirm the statement of William of Alnwick, a Franciscan scholar who wrote in the early fourteenth century, that Grosseteste commented on Aristotle and other writers in two ways ; he jotted notes in the margins (these were

sometimes collected later), and he commented in continuous form. William of Alnwick argued that the bishop's authentic thought, that is what should be accepted as his definite opinions, is to be found in the continuous commentaries, not in his unsystematic annotations: "Hence the sayings of the lord Lincolniensis which he wrote *authentice* when he commented on the books of the blessed Dionysius and in his *Hexameron* and in his exposition of the *Posterior Analytics* [of Aristotle] are authentic, while not all that he wrote down on schedules or in out of the way places (*in abditis*) should be accepted as authentic." My second example is the discovery by Professor Harrison Thomson of Grosseteste's compilation of a long list of symbols to signify over four hundred topics, arranged under nine main heads or "distinctions", taken from the Bible and the Fathers. In a Lyons MS. the list of signs is followed by a concordance (intended to receive additions and to be "constantly growing") of the passages relevant to each sign; and sure enough at least two books survive, in one of which the margins are dotted with these signs or figures in the bishop's own hand, and in the other in another hand, possibly that of his friend Adam Marsh, the Oxford Franciscan.¹ Gascoigne himself possessed the former book, now Bodley MS. 198, a gift to him from the Oxford Franciscans, and calls attention to Grosseteste's notes. Obviously, the bishop, an omnivorous reader, had compiled a handy concordance to enable him to lay his hands on reference to any particular topic discussed in the books which he had read. The margins of the concordance itself show that he extended his references to authors other than the Fathers, to Aristotle, Boethius, Cicero, Horace, Seneca, Ptolemy and the Christian poets.

Grosseteste read books through; he did not depend upon collections of extracts. For instance, the view, based upon the very exacting judgement of Roger Bacon, that he was not thoroughly familiar with Aristotle, is misleading. He was not a profound Aristotelian, like his contemporary John Blund and the great scholars of Paris and Oxford later in the century, but he studied many of Aristotle's writings, especially the *Posterior*

¹ *Speculum*, ix (1934), 139-44.

Analytics and the scientific books, and as bishop he directed, with the aid of Greeks in his household, the first complete translation of the *Ethics*, of which only the first three books had previously appeared in a Latin version. If this enterprise is considered in the light of intellectual developments current in the second half of the thirteenth and in later centuries, it is seen to have been a very precious gift to learning. It and Grosseteste's own notes on the *Ethics* aroused widespread interest abroad. Adam Marsh took much trouble to arrange for the transmission of a manuscript containing some of his friend's work on the *Ethics* to a distinguished scholar and preacher in Provence who had heard and clamoured for it. The book was to be transmitted to Provence by Queen Eleanor's physician. As we should say now-a-days, it was to go in the diplomatic bag.

As I have said already, Grosseteste's name was never forgotten; but his place in history, both as a scholar and as a bishop, has not been understood until our own day, and probably not yet fully or quite fairly. The foundations have been laid by Ludwig Baur's edition of his philosophical works (Münster, 1912) and by Professor Thomson's valuable and almost incredibly industrious survey of the manuscripts of all his writings (1940). A book by Mr. A. C. Crombie, a scientist who is devoting himself with knowledge and ability to the history of scientific thought, will shortly appear on Grosseteste's scientific importance.¹ The fine edition of his letters by H. R. Luard, which appeared as long ago as 1861, has come to its own as historical scholars examine more carefully Grosseteste's place in the busy and intelligent society in which he moved. We hear little or nothing nowadays of Grosseteste as an anti-papal defender of a local national church and a forerunner of King Henry VIII, partly because the capacity of medieval man for energetic criticism of his surroundings no longer surprises us even in the most convinced believer in papal authority. The more sensitive a man was to the obligations of the Catholic faith, the more keenly he would feel the responsibility of the individual,

¹ Since this lecture was delivered the book has appeared from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, under the title, *Robert Grosseteste and the origins of Experimental Science, 1110-1700*.

a fact which could lead to the Inquisition but could also lead, in a society of loose texture, to much more freedom of expression than is possible in most of the world today. Just as, within the Christian society as a whole, the problem of the relations between spiritual and secular authority provoked freedom in discussion, so, within the ecclesiastical system, decisions about policy, the definition of doubtful questions of law, the search for the wise direction of tendencies in thought, discipline and religious life from the parish to the cloister, could only be kept alive in the intelligent exercise of debate, and this implied personal responsibility. The repression of heresy and error was in Grosseteste's time secondary to the exploration of an exciting world of spiritual and mental experience, shared by all who were capable of feeling it and whose minds were open to it. The Manichean heresy, so threatening in Languedoc, was a disease to be stamped out, not a warning that the search for truth in free debate was pernicious. The schools in particular were regarded as essential to the well-being of the Church. They were a source of light, a spring of energy, a nursery of popes, cardinals and bishops, a training ground for theologians, preachers, jurists and medical experts. Attempts to restrain their activity were jealously watched, and were usually unsuccessful. Even St. Bernard had not been able to halt the theological movement which distressed him. Not long after Grosseteste's death an attack upon the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas stirred a kind of civil war in the universities of Paris and Oxford; the suggestion that he propounded views dangerous to the faith, like those of the extreme Joachimites or the thorough-going Averroists, was regarded as outrageous. As we all know, the Thomistic debate continued and still continues at a more decorous level.

Grosseteste, as a young and inquisitive scholar, lived in the earlier stage of the impact of new learning upon the schools whose form it had helped to shape and enliven. Theologically he was an orthodox student of the Fathers, and particularly of St. Augustine. Here he was an adventurer only in the onerous responsibilities of the pastoral life. As an original scholar, who was acquainted with the Aristotelian logic, as he was with the

main principles of law and medicine, he became curious about the physical universe as a reflection of Divine goodness. He was a cosmographer, interested in the stars and the wonder of light and sound. He knew all about the *computus* or science of astronomical measurement and reckoning in space and time. He was acquainted with Arabian arithmetic and science. As a countryman of lively mind he was observant of the natural world. In this age of intelligent wonder and receptiveness, some scholars became encyclopaedists and compiled more or less orderly accounts of everything they could know, just as builders used their experience to devise structures which depended upon new forces of balance and stress, and artists in stone and glass decorated them with sculpture and windows which imply a learned guidance. Grosseteste's powerful and orderly mind preferred to meditate about the explanation of things. He sought the principles of order at work in them. As he taught and wrote about the inductive method of inquiry into known facts, explained by Aristotle in his *Posterior Analytics*, he felt compelled to go further and to understand, what apparently none of the Greeks had been able to establish, how to discriminate between possible theories suggested by the investigation. The story of the tortuous development of theories about physical reality, the nature of substance, species and motion, and the essential function of tests by observation and experiment, begins in the later twelfth century in logical refinements upon Aristotle's argument and continues in the Middle Ages through speculations at Oxford and Paris and in the Italian schools. The importance of Grosseteste lies in his understanding of the procedure of verification and falsification on which modern experimental science is based, and in his influence upon the Oxford school, and especially upon Roger Bacon. In a short paper on the notion of species in medieval philosophy and science Dr. Crombie has described Grosseteste's contribution as follows :¹

The criterion of truth was whether a hypothesis "saved the appearances". However, since the same effect might follow from more than one cause, and since it was never possible to know all the possible causes of a given effect, it was never possible to reach absolutely certain knowledge of the cause of that

¹ *Archives internationales d'histoire des sciences* (1951), pp. 365-73.

effect. All that could be done was to eliminate false causes by experiment or observation, and to go on using the ones that had not yet been eliminated. Among these, the simplest was likely to be nearest the truth about Nature.

Thus Grosseteste held that the unaided human mind by itself could gain only probable knowledge of reality, though he thought that God might illuminate the mind with absolute and certain knowledge. His theory of science was a method of getting as close to the truth about Nature as was humanly possible. Moreover, like a good Platonist, he held that that truth would show that the physical world was in some sense "really mathematical". In fact, he believed that the fundamental physical substance was light, and that the nature of light could be understood only by means of geometry, through geometrical optics.

The self-discipline acquired by Grosseteste in the scientific environment of the study of the arts in the Oxford schools helped to form his theological teaching and the studies which he pursued during his brief but important period of office as the first *lector* of the Franciscans at Oxford and after his elevation to the episcopate in 1235. Father Callus, whose opinion carries great weight, has suggested that he planned to write a comprehensive *summa* of theology, on the lines of that composed by William of Auxerre. Enough survives of his numerous writings and enough is known of his projected works to justify this suggestion. The plan would appeal to his orderly mind. As his theological *questiones* show,¹ the *summa* would have been a conservative work, based upon Peter the Lombard's *Sentences* (the official handbook of theology) and the *Summa* of William of Auxerre, and inspired by the tradition of St. Augustine, the *De Sacramentis* of Hugh of St. Victor and the Greek Fathers available to him. He came to maturity too early to expatiate on the "new" Aristotle, the *De Anima* and the *Metaphysics*, or to incline his mind to the more specialized discussions in philosophy and theology which prepared the way for the comprehensive system of St. Thomas.

His interest lay in the great texts and led to his translations from the Greek. Miss Beryl Smalley has pointed out² that his commentaries on the *Hexameron* and on the Psalter "show a deliberate cult of the Greek Fathers". He was one of the

¹ Extracts from these have been edited by Father Callus in the paper in which he has elaborated his suggestion: *Studies in medieval history presented to F. M. Powicke* (1948), pp. 180-208.

² *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2nd edn., 1952), pp. 336-7.

first to resume the study of St. Basil's *Hexameron* in the Latin translation familiar to Bede five centuries before and is known to have borrowed a copy of this book from his friends at Bury St. Edmunds. His *Hexameron* indeed was probably the link between his last days at Oxford and the translations of the *De fide Orthodoxa* of St. John Damascene previously known through a twelfth century translation, and of the Pseudo-Dionysian corpus and his commentaries upon it, later followed by the translation of Aristotle's *Ethics*, to which I have already referred. His theological teaching had directed his mind to big questions in Christian cosmography and ecclesiastical policy. At Paris, for example, he had got to know the famous commentator on the Pseudo-Dionysius, Thomas of Vercelli, and the friendship would have helped to give a theological direction to his cosmological interests. In the *Hexameron*, which, Father Callus tells us, indicates his technique in the manipulation of his sources, his relish for cosmological topics leads him to discuss that theological *crux*, the eternity of the world, and to inveigh against the "moderns" who would turn the heretic Aristotle into a catholic, in their desire to maintain his heretical views on this subject, and deny the truths of creation. During fifteen busy years the aged scholar used his scanty leisure as bishop to work with his clerks and translators. His country manors where he stayed, Stow by Lincoln, Buckden on the London road, Fingest in its lovely hollow in the Chilterns, and many other places were the scenes of this congenial relief from the business and troubles of the episcopal day.

Grosseteste's public life as Bishop of Lincoln was informed by two experiences, one his outlook on the universe as a scholar, the other the realization of his duties as a prelate, an experience which, though of slow and steady growth, was doubtless given a more urgent and personal edge by his friendship with the friars at Oxford.

His curiosity about natural things, his scientific accuracy, and his consciousness of a wider world, embracing the celestial hierarchy, directed by an omnipresent God, and sanctioned by an over-ruling natural law revealed in the Scriptures and claiming the allegiance of the informed will—all this and much more

was fostered and defined by his experience as a scholar and a friend of scholars. That no responsible teacher should say anything unless he was sure of it and had studied its ground and implications, was a truth to which he often recurred. In one of his earlier books, the *De cessatione legalium*, he applies it to the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, in which all truth is contained.¹ The *De cessatione* attracted attention in the seventeenth century; some of it was printed, with an appreciation of its author, in London in 1658; its subject, the relations between the Old and the New Law, as revealed by the Scriptures and interpreted by the wisest doctors, was felt to be of topical interest. A new sign, says Grosseteste, does not necessarily "evacuate" an old sign. The observance of the Sabbath, for example, is so generally (*communiter*) useful and necessary that it proclaims itself to have been ordained by God, not as temporary but as permanent in the order of the universe. Reason cannot make the supreme reason better. The significance of the observance in the new order, he points out later, requires the most careful regard to the literal texts in the search for their allegorical meaning. "A good teacher does not inform the mind of his disciple by means of the abbreviated word but of the full word, and every scholar of a master or an art knows how to distinguish between the two and finds the master's intention fully and clearly in his perfected and rounded (*integrus*) utterances. So the elucidation of Scripture must be based upon the text as a whole, the naked word, not on truncated and casual words." This instruction is clearly in the Augustinian tradition. St. Augustine tried "to steer a middle course between literal and allegorical expositions". Earnest meditation on the text is needed if the interpretation "which tends to establish the reign of charity" is to be found.² Grosseteste explained this tradition in the light of the new scholastic method. He was on the way to the canons of interpretation laid down by St. Thomas;³ but his

¹ For this work and the MSS. see S. H. Thomson, *op. cit.* pp. 121-2. The book has never been fully and well edited. The argument and contents of the part printed in 1658 do not confirm Thomson's view that the work was a deliberate contribution to a current anti-Jewish movement.

² Smalley, *op. cit.* pp. 23-4.

³ *Ibid.* p. 300.

point of view is best approached by way of Roger Bacon, who stood nearer to him and gave high praise to his expositions of Scripture.

Bacon firmly believed that all wisdom is contained in the Bible, and that the Bible should be *the* text of theological study in the schools, just as great and authoritative texts were the objects of study in other faculties. The Bible should not be neglected, as he thought it too often was, and displaced by a textbook, the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard. And, as all knowledge is contained in the Bible, though not fully expressed, the theologian must know all things ; every new truth can both be found there and must be used to elucidate its teaching. Hence it is essential to have an accurate text, a new edition of the Vulgate, newly based on the Hebrew and Greek originals and on the best manuscripts of the Latin version. Then the theologian as scientist and moralist can safely come to grips with it. Dr. A. G. Little quotes Bacon's observations on a passage in *Ecclesiasticus* : " A man blowing a furnace is in works of heat ; but the sun three times more, burning up the mountains." Bacon interpreted the Latin, *tripliciter*, not as " three times more " but as " in a threefold manner ". His scientific interest in optics insisted that an optical interpretation was required, and he added " an elaborate disquisition on the incidence of the sun's rays and the laws of reflection and refraction ".¹ Grosseteste, in spite of his high regard for the science of optics, could not have been carried away so far ; but he would certainly have agreed with Bacon's views about the place of the Bible in theological teaching. He himself expressed his views about this very clearly and precisely in a well-known letter (no. 123) to the Oxford regents in theology. As we have seen, he also believed in the need for a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek.

Probably the quickest way to realize how Grosseteste as a Christian scholar applied his mind to the world about him as part of an ordered universe under divine direction would be the study of his *Dicta*, one of the most popular of his works ; for this miscellaneous collection of 147 passages, mainly taken from his sermons and lectures, including the whole of some of the

¹ *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xiv (1928), 288.

sermons delivered to the clergy or people while he was a teacher in the schools, was obviously intended as a work of edification. Unhappily, only twenty-one of the *Dicta* have been published. These were printed by Edward Brown in his valuable *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum* in 1690. Professor Harrison Thomson, in his book on the writings of Grosseteste, has given a full list with brief indications of their contents (pp. 216-32). A more satisfactory guide to Grosseteste's mind would be editions of his commentaries, especially his *moralia* on the Gospels and his work on the Psalter. Thomson has listed ninety-two sermons which he regards as certainly Grosseteste's and seventy-five more, mainly from an early Durham manuscript, which he feels safe in attributing to him; but only one or two have been published. Gascoigne in the fifteenth century was emphatic that Grosseteste commented on all the Epistles of St. Paul, but only one, on the Epistle to the Galatians, has survived, though another, on the Romans, may also be his. None of them has been printed. Hence we have to rely upon the Letters, and fortunately these are full and comprehensive, and can be supplemented by the numerous letters written to the bishop by his disciple and friend, the Franciscan Adam Marsh.

One of the sermons from which extracts have appeared in print¹ was preached by Grosseteste to the Franciscans in chapter. Its theme is the ladder of poverty. The preacher characteristically urges his hearers to avoid the pride latent in humility and always to remember the end or purpose of their way of life. This Aristotelean emphasis on the intention of things and the subordination of every grade in the ordered scale of being to its superior grade is as fundamental to an understanding of Grosseteste's life as a bishop and his outlook on practical issues as it is in the development of philosophical thought in the thirteenth century. The conception, however, implies a scale of values, and, in this case, of theological and cosmological values, which must guide the religious life, whether contemplative or ecclesiastical or parochial, and in particular illuminate the cure of souls. Theology, so he said in one of

¹ In A. G. Little's edition of Thomas of Eccleston's *De adventu fratrum minorum in Angliam* (Paris, 1909), pp. 178-87.

his *Dicta* (no. 118), turns the syllogism to spiritual uses and catches in its net spiritual fish who are readily caught. Here we come to the influences which clarified the mind and strengthened the will of the elderly scholar in the years which preceded his episcopate.

What made him consent to change his life at Oxford for the duties of a diocesan? And what made him, in contrast to that other great scholar, St. Edmund of Abingdon, who in these same years became Archbishop of Canterbury and found that he could not tolerate the burden, so resolute and forthright a prelate? I do not know, but I suspect that his friendship with and admiration for the new mendicant orders had something to do with his decision and his pertinacity. The arrival of the orders in 1221 and 1224 and their immediate establishment in Oxford had aroused much excitement. Their sense of purpose and their modes of life had created a deep impression. About the time when Grosseteste agreed to supervise Franciscan studies in the humble Greyfriars, Jordan of Saxony, St. Dominic's successor as Master General of the Dominicans, came on a visit to England. He preached on St. Martin's day (11 Nov. 1229) in Oxford and issued a "challenge to the prelates assembled there to save the souls of the people throughout England". Grosseteste, who, in a letter (no. 40) written to the Master General some years later, recalls the intimate and friendly conversations which he had had with him in Oxford, must have heard this sermon. Its text survives in the Durham manuscript which contains the material for Grosseteste's work on the Psalms and many of his own sermons.¹ Brother Jordan, speaking from the texts Judith viii. 21: "You are priests in the people of God, from you hangs their soul" and Isa. xxii. 23, 24, on the nail fastened in a sure place, from which all kinds of vessels hung, exclaimed, "Oh, my God, where shall be found a cord so long that the people of all the parishes of England may hang on it? Will it come from their prelates residing in Oxford? God knows, I know not. But we do know that if the column falls or the nail gives way, all the vessels which

¹ A. G. Little, in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* liv (1939), 1-19, has edited Jordan's sermon and two others preached by him in England.

hang on it will fall and be broken." And then, turning to the masters in the schools, he warned them against pride and cupidity and the desire for worldly promotion. "We read in Matthew how the devil lifted the Lord to the pinnacle of the Temple, which signifies the status of the *magisterium*. The devil has placed many there, all, that is to say, who are so eager to be made or called masters that they may be honoured and advanced in temporal things. There is nothing wrong in being called master ; it is the height of pride to *wish* to be called master."

About this time Grosseteste became the first lecturer to the Franciscans. Brother Thomas of Eccleston, who wrote the story of the arrival of the friars minor in England, put on record their debt to their teacher. "Under him within a short time," he says, "they made incalculable progress both in scholastic discussion, and the subtle moralities suitable for preaching". In 1232 he decided to resign his prebends, including the arch-deaconry of Leicester. He retained only his prebend in the cathedral church of Lincoln. In a letter (no. 8) to his sister Juetta, who was a nun, telling her of his decision, he says : "You, who wear the habit and have bought the vow of the religious life, must not be at all disturbed or sorry. If I am poorer by my own choice, I am made richer in virtues. If I am more despicable in the eyes of the world, I am more acceptable to the citizens of heaven. If I have given up temporal things for the sake of obedience, only by obedience can I merit heavenly things. You should love more in me the good which you love in yourself, the more closely we are bound together by ties of the flesh." He seems to have felt some doubt whether Juetta would receive his news with the sisterly and sympathetic understanding that he had the right to expect from a cloistered nun.

Hitherto I have tried to tell you what sort of man it was who was appointed to a big bishopric at an advanced age. Now, in the brief time that remains, let us see how Grosseteste applied his principles as he faced his task during the next eighteen years.

His most troublesome problem in England was his relations with the dean and chapter of Lincoln. His right of episcopal

visitation was challenged. The long and dramatic controversy which ensued had finally to be settled in his favour by the Pope. Early in the dispute (c. 1239) he prepared for the dean and chapter a long essay about the relations which should exist between a bishop and his cathedral chapter (Epistle 127). This illustrates perfectly his conception of the Church as an organism. It is based upon arguments made clear by examples—examples taken from the Old Testament, examples drawn from daily life, examples suggested by his almost passionate interest in the nature of light. Moses, as the meaning of his name suggests, is the type of a Christian prelate. When he gave duties to his helpers he did not surrender power but reserved his own rights ; just as the sun is no less the source of light when its rays are reflected by a mirror and throw light in places not directly exposed to them. Moses and his helpers correspond to the Pope and the bishops ; each bishop in his own diocese is what the Pope is in the whole Church and controls his assistants in the same way, and the dean and chapter have their helpers, and so down to the lowest. A bishop's powers may be limited ; for example, he cannot visit Cistercian abbeys as each abbot can visit the houses affiliated to his own mother abbey ; but every case of this kind depends upon a privilege granted by the Pope. A dean cannot visit his own chapter, for he resides in the cathedral with it, and even if he could, he could not exclude the bishop. The Pope is like the sun, giving light to moon and stars. He imparts power to bishops who impart power to others. Just as the Pope cannot diminish his plentitude of power unless a mandate from Christ approves his action, because of its advantage (*utilitatis*), so no bishop can give away any of his authority. Moreover no civil law or custom can stand in his way, for custom is a positive, not a negative thing, and cannot overrule the exercise of the good. Underlying all this formal argument about structure is the conception of the happiness and freedom which cordial co-operation in the salvation of souls can and should bring to all. All are watchmen, trusting in the watchfulness of their subordinates. All are shepherds anxious for the safety of the sheep. In another memorandum, written eleven years later for the guidance of Archbishop Boniface

of Canterbury, Grosseteste likens the hierarchy to the subdivision of an immense flock, 10,000 sheep divided into thousands, thousands into hundreds, hundreds into tens, each group or multiple of groups under its shepherd, feeding and watching the sheep¹. To revert to the pamphlet for the dean and chapter, Grosseteste argued that here was true liberty, for as Philo-Judaeus wrote: "The slave is everyone who sins; the freeman is everyone who labours for the good." And so, throughout this long argument the bishop turns from one aspect of the theme to another, with inexhaustible fertility in Scriptural analogy. It appears to have made very little impression upon the canons.¹ They lived decently and contentedly in an English world of rights, customs, precedents, social distinctions, secular and ecclesiastical. They resented this instruction from a low-born prelate, who brought newfangled mendicant friars into his household to help him to get on with his diocesan job.

Everything that Grosseteste did and said as bishop can be brought within the implications of this document. Neither his view of the universe nor its expression in the details of a reformed ecclesiasticism was new. Some of it was very old, much had been defined in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council and again by Stephen Langton at a provincial council at Oxford in 1222, and yet again in episcopal constitutions. The qualities which made Grosseteste so formidable and brought him to the front were the range of his incisive mind, his tireless energy and the grandeur of his character.

He was a leader from the first years of his episcopate, a propelling force which might be deplored but could not be disregarded. In letters to Archbishop Edmund and the justice William Raleigh he gave the clearest and most orderly statement yet made of the grievances of the clergy and the subordination

¹ Dr. R. W. Hunt has recently discovered the reply of the Chancellor of Lincoln in Bodl. MS. 760, ff. 176^v-178^v. It rebuts the views that the bishop has authority, except to instruct and teach, over the members of chapter and their vicars and peculiars, and that correction of the dean lies with the bishop: '*ex consuetudine cathedralium Anglie capitulum totum ita ut sumatur capitulum collective et formaliter corrigat decanum*'. I owe the summary in this note to Miss Dorothy Williamson of the Lincoln Diocesan Record Office.

of the common law to the law of the Church. His constitutions or directions to his clergy were, in Professor Cheney's opinion, more widely adopted than any others were in later episcopal constitutions. His lists of *gravamina* initiated a movement which found periodic expression during the next hundred years. His pertinacity in inquiries into the conduct and character of the laity in his widespread diocese, a form of interference with the king's subjects for which at least twice he was called to account by the royal authority, set an example which could not be disregarded in giving this episcopal duty such effectiveness as it ever had in English medieval life. His insistence that prelates and clergy should not accept secular office found little response, but must, I think, have done much, at a critical time, to set the tradition of clerical independence later expressed in a separate convocation of the clergy, distinct from parliament.

He knew everybody and feared nobody. At King Henry's request he instructed him on the nature of an anointed king, and in so doing courteously reminded him of his responsibility for the maintenance of his subjects in peace and justice and of his duty to abstain from any interference with the cure of souls. He would allow no compromise on matters of principle. The common law of the Church should be applied in the light of equity, the dictate of conscience, and the teaching of natural law, as revealed in the Scriptures, implicit in the working of a Divine Providence, and conformable to the teaching and guidance of Christ in the Church militant on earth. Hence came his fierce attacks upon legal pedantry and venality in the ecclesiastical courts, notably the court of Canterbury, and upon Archbishop Boniface's exaction of procurations on an early visitation which, so the bishops insisted, had a financial rather than a spiritual objective, his hatred of the indiscriminate provision to benefices by the papal court and the exploitation of parishes by monastic houses, his minute scrutiny of presentations to benefices and dignities, his urgent expostulations in his letters of counsel to all kinds of persons in positions of civil or ecclesiastical authority, and the influence which he could exercise over men like Earl Simon de Montfort. His memory was venerated by like-minded men, and was invoked in times of

revolt by many who can have had no clear idea of the cause for which he stood, the art of arts, the salvation of souls.

In no matter was Grosseteste more true to himself than in his relations with the papacy. He was a thorough-going papalist. The Vicar of Christ was the lynch pin upon which the whole fabric of the Church depended ; but he was the Vicar of Christ, and woe betide if he fell short of his awful responsibilities. Orthodox minds were more outspoken than they were in post-Tridentian days in their criticism of papal behaviour. The rapid development of the ecclesiastical system under the impulse of the papal plenitude of power was itself a justification of their concern during the century and a half which separate St. Bernard's paternal warnings to his friend Pope Eugenius III from the unseemly relations between Pope Boniface VIII and his cardinals. Some distinguished canonists found a solution in the conception of the Church as a whole, and the college of cardinals in particular, as corporations. Thus Hostiensis worked out the implications of the current view that the cardinals are part of the Pope's body. "Not the Pope alone but the cardinals also are comprehended in the expression of the *plenitudo potestatis*", which remains with the cardinals during a vacancy in the Holy See. The Pope could certainly act on his own initiative, he was not compelled to adopt the advice of the cardinals, but his decision must not "tend to subvert the well-being of the Universal Church". But what if it does? Here Hostiensis went farther than the other leading canonists. He maintained that in matters of faith the ultimate authority is a general council.¹ Grosseteste followed a personal course when he was confronted by the problem of papal error. He was a theologian, not a professional canonist. In practice, and probably in principle, he was not affected by the legal theory of corporation. He trusted rather to the mystical union of the church whose authoritative expression on earth was the Vicar of Christ. As an English bishop he did not regard himself, as Hostiensis seems to have regarded all bishops, as bound to consult his chapter, as the Pope consulted his cardinals. In his dealings with the

¹ See Brian Tierney, "A conciliar theory of the thirteenth century", in *The Catholic Historical Review*, xxxvi (Jan. 1951), 415-40.

papal Curia he kept in touch with friendly cardinals, as all important litigants liked to do, and he was very conscious of the value to be attached to the influence of the Sacred College ;¹ but as a thorough-going papalist he could and would appeal to an erring Pope alone as man to man.

He was prepared, indeed, to support his English episcopal colleagues in deploring the extent of papal exactions and, needless to say, in appealing for papal support against all kinds of secular interference in the ecclesiastical system, but he was mainly concerned to emphasize the responsibility of the Curia for the danger to the pastoral care of a narrow and pedantic insistence on the common law in church and state, the demoralizing effect of papal provisions and Archbishop Boniface's perversion of his right to visit his province, so different from his own conception of an episcopal visitation. In 1250, when he was at least eighty years of age, he went to the Papal Court to make his protest. He stood up alone, attended by nobody but his official, Robert Marsh, who wrote a description of the scene with a text of the memoranda presented by the bishop and of the speeches which he made. Pope Innocent IV sat there with his cardinals and members of his household to hear the most thorough and vehement attack that any great Pope can ever have had to hear at the height of his power.² Three years later, in the year of his death, Grosseteste, in a letter of protest addressed to a papal agent and notary against a papal provision of the Pope's nephew to a benefice, took the extreme step. He refused, in the name of papal power, to obey the papal mandate. Some scholars, confining their attention to the letter alone, have rejected it as a forgery, though it is one of the best authenticated of Grosseteste's works ; but in fact it accords with all his moral and cosmological convictions. Pope Innocent had presented his nephew, explicitly setting aside any obstacles or episcopal privileges of any kind, as a naked act of papal authority. Grosseteste, old, tired and angry, but in full control of his mental faculties, denounced the papal mandate as an act of sin

¹ Cf. *Epistolae*, no. 36, for Grosseteste's high view of the Pope *with his cardinals* as giving light and beauty to the universe.

² S. H. Thomson, *op. cit.* pp. 141-7.

impossible to the Apostolic See. He went on, "No faithful subject in pure and full obedience to the Holy See, who is not schismatically cut off from the body of Christ and the same See, can be in accord with this or any other mandate of its kind, even though it came from the highest order of Angels. Wherefore, reverend Sir, out of the obedience and fealty by which I am bound, as a child to his parents, to the most Holy Apostolic See and the love I bear to its union with the Body of Christ, filially and obediently I do not obey, I reject, I rebel against the contents of this letter."¹

That this outburst came from the depth of his being and expressed his inmost conviction is shown very clearly if we place it beside the following passage in the memorandum presented three years earlier to Pope Innocent and the cardinals :²

This most holy see is the throne of God and like to the sun of the world in His sight. Whence, just as there exists causally in the sun the whole illumination of this world, its vegetation, nutrition of sensible life, augmentation, consummation, conservation, beauty and grace ; and just as the sun is always causing all these things to flow [*influre*] into this sensible world, and so makes and keeps the world sensible and perfect ; so this most holy see ought to have all these things, spiritually understood, within itself causally, and ought to cause all these things to flow unceasingly upon that whole spiritual world of which it is the spiritual sun, and so save that spiritual world. Otherwise, just as, if the causal reasons [*rationes causales*] in the visible sun and the influences from it upon the world should fail, straightway this whole sensible world would perish ; even so, if the spiritual causal reasons, which correspond to those of the sun, and the corresponding influences upon the spiritual world, should fail in this spiritual sun, this world, of which it is the sun, must needs perish, and it must be the cause and be guilty of this perdition, especially since these causal reasons and the influences therefrom are in its free power. But God forbid, God forbid that this sun, entirely shining in intelligence and always straight in its justice, should at any time be turned into darkness and turn black like a piece of sackcloth or turn backwards.

This passage anticipates in some measure the argument in the *Monarchia* where Dante maintains the function and necessity of universal Empire as the ultimate end for the universal civil order of mankind, on the ground that "the work proper to the human race, taken as a whole, is to keep the whole capacity of the potential intellect constantly actualised". Grosseteste expressed himself in terms natural to a student of natural

¹ *Epistolae*, no. 128 ; cf. Thomson, pp. 212-13.

² Edward Brown, *Fasciculus*, ii. 254 ; the translation is by Mr. W. A. Pantin.

science and the pseudo-Dionysius, Dante as a reader of Aristotle's *Politics* influenced by Averroistic thought ;¹ but the impression conveyed by both is of a great organism working at full strength. The difference between them is this : Grosseteste was afflicted by the incredible fear that the papacy, at the height of its power, might falter in its function as the source of vivifying light ; whereas Dante, in a mood of temporary exaltation, saw in the restoration and enlargement of an empire which had ceased to function the only way to unite mankind on earth. Grosseteste was shocked by the possible perversity of a great power whose operations were affecting every Christian soul, Dante, as he came to feel, was (to use a fine phrase of Professor d'Entreves) confusing the mission of a man with that of the Divine Saviour.

Each of these great men expected the impossible from the human nature which each, in his own way, desired to save from disorder and corruption. Grosseteste, in his urgency and strong faith in the existing ecclesiastical system, underrated the virile forces at work in the world about him, and the opportunities open to the good no less than to the bad. He may, for all we know, have been a different man in his personal relationships with his flock, but I fear that he was too old, too certain of himself, too tidy-minded, to keep in touch with the souls which he longed to save. I can see few traces of the grace of compassion in his revealing letters.² Adam Marsh himself thought sometimes that he was too hard. He and Simon de Montfort had this fault in common. In one of his last letters to his archdeacons (c. 1250-1), a letter which he ordered them to have read throughout his diocese, he writes despairingly about the state of his spiritual subjects. He had even, he says,

¹ Cf. A. P. d'Entreves, *Dante as a Political Thinker* (1952), pp. 47-51.

² At least one sermon, and a very popular sermon, strikes a gentler note. The bishop advises any parish priest who knew no Latin to persuade a better-informed neighbour to go through the text of the Gospel for the following Sunday with him, so that he can teach it to his flock. The passage was translated in a Lollard tract, which was published at Marlborough in 1530, and copied by John Foxe into his *Actes and Monuments* in 1563. See Curt F. Bühler, 'A Lollard Tract : on translating the Bible into English', in *Medium Aevum*, vii (1938), 167-83, at pp. 175 (translation), 182 (Grosseteste's text).

decided to resign, but had been prevented by higher authority. In fact he seems to have relied too much upon the efficacy of injunctions and exhortations and his disciplinary powers. He had not really got to know his sheep as a good shepherd should ; not, for example, as one of his successors, Oliver Sutton, Bishop of Lincoln from 1280 to 1299, was to get to know them.¹ Yet, when all is said, he was one of those rare men whose minds and spirits move easily in the universe of things and in practical life do not fear to face the consequences. This year his church at Lincoln will venerate him as the greatest of her bishops ; and, in my view, the University of Oxford would not be far wrong if she were to honour him as the greatest of her sons.

¹ See Rosalind Hill, *Oliver Sutton* (Lincoln Minster Pamphlets, no. 4, 1950), and her paper on "Public Penance: some problems of a thirteenth century bishop", in *History*, for October 1951 (N.S. xxxvi, pp. 213-26).

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

GENERAL WORKS, BIBLIOGRAPHY, Etc.

- BÜCHER BEWEGTEN DIE WELT. Eine Kulturgeschichte des Buches. Von *Karl Schottenloher*. Band II. Vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Stuttgart, Hiersemann Verlag, 1952. 8vo, pp. 281-613.
- DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN LATIN AMERICA. The São Paulo Conference. Paris, UNESCO [Public Library Manuals, 5] [1952]. 8vo, pp. 192. *Wrappers. Illustrated. 6s.*
- MAGIC BOOKS FROM MEXICO. With an introduction and notes on the plates by *C. A. Burland*. Harmondsworth, Middx., Penguin Books Ltd. [The King Penguin Books, 64] [1953]. 8vo, pp. 31, 16. *Illustrated. 4s. 6d.*
- NATIONALMUSEET, KØBENHAVN: GYLDNE BØGER. Illuminerede middelalderlige håndskrifter i Danmark og Sverige. 5. april—1952—4. mai. [København, 1952]. 8vo, pp. 95. *Wrappers. Facsimiles.*
- THE OFFICIAL HANDBOOK OF THE MANCHESTER DISTRICT, 1952-53. A publication of the *Municipal Information Bureau*. Manchester, Town Hall [1952]. 8vo, pp. iv, 437. 8s. 6d.
- ÖSTERREICHISCHE NATIONALBIBLIOTHEK: ABENDLÄNDISCHE BUCHMALEREI. Katalog der Ausstellung im Prunksaal, Mai-Oktober 1952. Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1952. 8vo, pp. 86. *Wrappers.*
- THE WORLD ENCOMPASSED. An exhibition of the history of maps held at the Baltimore Museum of Art, October 7 to November 23 1952. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, 1952. 4to, pp. xiv, 125, 60. *Wrappers. Illustrated.*

ART

- MASTERPIECES IN THE VICTORIA & ALBERT MUSEUM. London, H.M.S.O., 1952. 4to. *An album of plates. 8s. 6d.*

GEOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY, Etc.

- CATALOGUE OF TYPES AND FIGURED SPECIMENS in the Geological Department of the Manchester Museum. By *J. Wilfrid Jackson*. Manchester, University Press [Manchester Museum Publication, 6], 1952. 8vo, pp. vii, 170. *Wrappers.*

HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

- DER BAMBERGER DOMSCHATZ in seinem Bestande bis zum Ende der Hohenstaufenzeit. Von *Wilhelm Messerer*. München, Hirmer Verlag [1952]. 4to, pp. 75, 90. *Illustrated.*
- INSCRIPTIONS CUNÉIFORMES du KULTÉPÉ. Vol. 1. Éditées par *Bedřich Hrozný*. Praha, Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství [Monografie Archivu Orientálního, 14], 1952. Fol. pp. 23, cxxix.

- JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS. Vol. 27. 1750-51. Published at the charge of the W. B. H. Dowse Fund. Boston, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1952. 8vo, pp. xii, 256. *Facsimile reproduction.*
- PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE, 300-438. By *James Everett Seaver*. Lawrence, University of Kansas Press [Humanistic Studies, 30], 1952. 8vo, pp. 101. *Wrappers.* \$2.00.
- ROMAN EXETER: ISCA DUMNONIORUM. Excavations in the war-damaged areas, 1945-1947. By *Aileen Fox*, with contributions by Sir *Ifor Williams*, R. G. *Goodchild*, and others. Manchester, University Press [University College of the South-West of England: History of Exeter Research Group Monographs, 8], 1952. 4to, pp. xvi, 104, xxv. *Illustrated.* 30s.
- A SHORT HISTORY OF SWITZERLAND. By *E. Bonjour*, *H. S. Offler* and *G. R. Potter*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952. *Maps.* 35s.
- SMITH COLLEGE TABLETS. 110 cuneiform texts selected from the College collection, by *Cyrus H. Gordon*. Northampton, Mass., Smith College [Studies in History, 38], 1952. 8vo, pp. 38, cxx. *Wrappers.* \$2.00.

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- JACQUES DU FOUILLOUX ET SON TRAITÉ DE LA VÉNERIE. Par *François Remigereau*. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres" [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 117], 1952. 8vo, pp. ii, 193. *Wrappers.*
- LA LÉGENDE DES NIBELUNGEN EN ALLEMAGNE AU XIX^e SIÈCLE. Par *Ernest Tonnelat*. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres" [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 119], 1952. 8vo, pp. iv, 155. *Wrappers.*
- RUTEBEUF: POÈMES CONCERNANT L'UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS. Texte établi et commenté par *H. H. Lucas*. Manchester, University Press [French Classics] [1952]. 8vo, pp. viii, 137. *Wrappers.* 7s. 6d.
- STENDHAL: HENRI III. Un acte inédit avec introduction et commentaire par *J. F. Marshall*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press [Studies in Language and Literature, 36, iv.], 1952. 8vo, pp. xii, 86. *Wrappers.*
- SYNTAXE DU PARLER WALLON DE LA GLEIZE. Par *Louis Remacle*. Tome I. Nomms et articles. Adjectifs et pronoms. Paris, "Les Belles Lettres" [Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 126], 1952. 8vo, pp. 403. *Wrappers.* Frs. 800.
- VICTORIAN SAMPLERS: William and Mary Howitt. By *Carl Ray Woodring*. Lawrence, University of Kansas Press [1952]. 8vo, pp. xi, 252. *Illustrated.* \$4.00.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

- DAS ÄLTESTE URBAR DES CISTERCIENSERKLOSTERS LANGHEIM um 1390. Mit einer besitz- und wirtschafts-geschichtlichen Einleitung bearbeitet von *Ferdinand Geldner*. Würzburg, Kommissionsverlag Ferdinand Schöningh [Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Fränkische Geschichte, 10, iii.], 1952. 8vo, pp. 79,* 202, xlv. *Wrappers.*

ARCANA CAELESTIA quae in Scriptura Sacra seu Verbo Domini sunt detecta . . . ab *Emanuele Swedenborg*. Tomus II. Editio tertia. London, Swedenborg Society, 1952. 8vo, pp. viii, 492. 12s. 6d.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE NEW CHURCH signified by the New Jerusalem in *The Revelation*. By *Emanuel Swedenborg*. London, Swedenborg Society, 1952. 8vo, pp. xii, 146. 3s. 6d.

BRIEF SURVEY OF THE EVOLUTION OF ISMAILISM. By *W. Ivanow*. Leiden, E. J. Brill [Ismaili Society : Series B. 7], 1952. 8vo, pp. 92. 4s.

THE CLOUD OF UNKNOWING and other treatises by an English mystic of the fourteenth century. With a commentary on *The Cloud* by *Augustine Baker*. Edited by Abbot *Justin McCann*. London, Burns Oates [Orchard Books] [1952]. 8vo, pp. xxix, 220. 16s.

THE JEWISH ANNUAL, 5713 (1952-53). Edited by *S. Levy*. Vol. xv. London, Williams, Lea & Co., Ltd., 1952. 8vo, pp. 96. *Wrappers*.

MISHNAH HORAYOTH: its history and exposition. Critical and explanatory notes by *P. R. Weis*. The text translated by *Edward Robertson*. Manchester, University Press [1952]. 8vo, pp. xxxvii, 111. 25s.

DIE *MODI SIGNIFICANDI* DES MARTINUS DE DACIA. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Sprachlogik im Mittelalter. Von *Heinrich Roos*. Münster Westfalen, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung [Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, 37, ii] [1952]. 8vo, pp. 167, 6. *Wrappers*.

QVINTI SEPTIMI FLORENTIS TERTVLLIANI OPERA. Pars I. Opera Catholica adversus Marcionem. Turnholti, Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii [Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 1], 1953. 8vo, pp. xxvii, 75. *Wrappers*. Frs. belg. 80.

THE RULE OF SAINT BENEDICT in Latin and English. Edited and translated by Abbot *Justin McCann*. London, Burns Oates [Orchard Books] [1952]. 8vo, pp. xxiv, 214. *Facsimile*. 16s.

THE ZADOKITE FRAGMENTS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. By *H. H. Rowley*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1952. 8vo, pp. xii, 133. 16s.

SOCIOLOGY

THE DARK AGE OF SCOTTISH LEGAL HISTORY, 1350-1650. Being the 19th lecture on the David Murray Foundation in the University of Glasgow delivered on 12 November, 1951, by Lord *Cooper*. Glasgow, Jackson, Son & Co. [Glasgow University Publications, 91], 1952. 8vo, pp. 30. *Wrappers*. 4s.

THE COLLEGE OF ST. SALVATOR. Commemoration of the five hundredth anniversary of the foundation, 20 and 21 September 1950. A record. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd [St. Andrews University Publications, 49], 1952. 8vo, pp. xliii, 92. *Illustrated*. 10s.

- LIBERTY IN THE MODERN WORLD.** Being the third lectures on the Chancellor Dunning Trust, delivered at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, 1952. By *Herbert Butterfield*. Toronto, Ryerson Press [1952]. 8vo, pp. ix, 59. \$2.25.
- PORTRAIT OF A HOSPITAL, 1752-1948.** To commemorate the bi-centenary of the Royal Infirmary, Manchester. By *William Brockbank*. London, W. Heinemann Ltd., 1952. 8vo, pp. x, 218. *Illustrated*. 25s.
- TWO STUDENTS AT ST. ANDREWS, 1711-1716.** Edited from the Devine papers by *William Croft Dickinson*. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd [St. Andrews University Publications, 50], 1952. 8vo, pp. lxxvii, 94. *Illustrated*. 15s.
- UNIVERSITETET I GREIFSWALD OCH DESS STÄLLNING I SVENSK KULTURPOLITIK, 1637-1815.** Av *Ivar Seth*. Uppsala, Wretmans Boktryckeri A.-B., 1952. 8vo, pp. viii, 474. *Wrappers*.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
ABERDEEN